

**H.R. 318, H.R. 4029, H.R. 4049,
H.R. 4182, H.R. 4272, H.R. 4283,
H.R. 4489, AND H.R. 4527**

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Tuesday, June 10, 2014

Serial No. 113-74

Printed for the use of the Committee on Natural Resources



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.fdsys.gov>

or

Committee address: <http://naturalresources.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

88-342 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2015

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

DOC HASTINGS, WA, *Chairman*
PETER A. DeFAZIO, OR, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK	Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, AS
Louie Gohmert, TX	Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ
Rob Bishop, UT	Grace F. Napolitano, CA
Doug Lamborn, CO	Rush Holt, NJ
Robert J. Wittman, VA	Raúl M. Grijalva, AZ
Paul C. Broun, GA	Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
John Fleming, LA	Jim Costa, CA
Tom McClintock, CA	Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Glenn Thompson, PA	Niki Tsongas, MA
Cynthia M. Lummis, WY	Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Dan Benishek, MI	Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Jeff Duncan, SC	Tony Cardenas, CA
Scott R. Tipton, CO	Jared Huffman, CA
Paul A. Gosar, AZ	Raul Ruiz, CA
Raúl R. Labrador, ID	Carol Shea-Porter, NH
Steve Southerland, II, FL	Alan S. Lowenthal, CA
Bill Flores, TX	Joe Garcia, FL
Jon Runyan, NJ	Matt Cartwright, PA
Markwayne Mullin, OK	Katherine M. Clark, MA
Steve Daines, MT	<i>Vacancy</i>
Kevin Cramer, ND	
Doug LaMalfa, CA	
Jason T. Smith, MO	
Vance M. McAllister, LA	
Bradley Byrne, AL	

Todd Young, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Legislative Counsel*
Penny Dodge, *Democratic Staff Director*
David Watkins, *Democratic Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

ROB BISHOP, UT, *Chairman*
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, AZ, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK	Niki Tsongas, MA
Louie Gohmert, TX	Rush Holt, NJ
Doug Lamborn, CO	Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Paul C. Broun, GA	Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Tom McClintock, CA	Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Cynthia M. Lummis, WY	Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Scott R. Tipton, CO	Carol Shea-Porter, NH
Raúl R. Labrador, ID	Joe Garcia, FL
Steve Daines, MT	Matt Cartwright, PA
Kevin Cramer, ND	Jared Huffman, CA
Doug LaMalfa, CA	<i>Vacancy</i>
Jason T. Smith, MO	Peter A. DeFazio, OR, <i>ex officio</i>
Vance M. McAllister, LA	
Doc Hastings, WA, <i>ex officio</i>	

CONTENTS

Hearing held on Tuesday, June 10, 2014	Page 1
Statement of Witnesses:	
Cleaver, Hon. Emanuel, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri	49
Duffy, Hon. Sean P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, Prepared statement of	62
Fountain, Edwin, Commissioner, World War I Centennial Commission	50
Prepared statement of	52
Knox, Victor, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities and Lands, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior	36
Prepared statement of	37
McClure, Steve, Commissioner, Union County Board of Commissioners	11
Prepared statement of	12
Michaud, Hon. Michael H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maine	2
Roberts, Christy, Ellington, Missouri	28
Prepared statement of	30
Ross, Hon. Robert, State Representative District 142, Missouri House of Representatives	33
Prepared statement of	34
Simpson, Hon. Michael K., a Representative in Congress from the State of Idaho, Prepared statement of	62
Walden, Hon. Greg, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon	4
Prepared statement of	6
Weber, William E., Colonel, United States Army, Retired; Chairman, Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation	54
Prepared statement of	55
Rebuttal to testimony of Victor Knox, Department of the Interior	57
Weldon, Leslie A.C., Deputy Chief, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture	7
Prepared statement of	8
Additional Material Submitted for the Record:	
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Prepared state- ment on H.R. 4272	66
Lecky, William P., Board of Directors for the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation, Prepared statement on H.R. 318	67
Letter submitted for the record by Rep. Grijalva on H.R. 4029 and H.R. 4182	82
Letters submitted for the record by Rep. Duffy on H.R. 4049	63
Letters submitted for the record by Rep. Walden on H.R. 4272	70
List of documents submitted for the record retained in the committee's official files	83
National Parks Conservation Association, Prepared statement on H.R. 4029, H.R. 4049, and H.R. 4182	69

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 318, TO AUTHORIZE A WALL OF REMEMBRANCE AS PART OF THE KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL AND TO ALLOW CERTAIN PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO FUND THAT WALL OF REMEMBRANCE; H.R. 4029, TO REQUIRE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO TRANSFER ALL FEDERAL LAND, FACILITIES, AND ANY OTHER ASSETS ASSOCIATED WITH THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS TO THE STATE OF MISSOURI FOR THE PURPOSES OF MAINTAINING A STATE PARK, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; H.R. 4049, TO AMEND THE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, TO ADJUST THE BOUNDARY OF THAT NATIONAL LAKESHORE TO INCLUDE THE LIGHTHOUSE KNOWN AS ASHLAND HARBOR BREAKWATER LIGHT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, "ASHLAND BREAKWATER LIGHT TRANSFER ACT"; H.R. 4182, TO PROVIDE THAT THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS SHALL BE ADMINISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THAT UNIT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; H.R. 4272, TO STOP IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE FOREST SERVICE TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE AND TO REQUIRE THE FOREST SERVICE TO INCORPORATE THE NEEDS, USES, AND INPUT OF AFFECTED COMMUNITIES BEFORE TAKING ANY TRAVEL MANAGEMENT ACTION AFFECTING ACCESS TO UNITS OF THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM DERIVED FROM THE PUBLIC DOMAIN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, "FOREST ACCESS IN RURAL COMMUNITIES ACT"; H.R. 4283, TO AMEND THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MAINTAIN OR REPLACE CERTAIN FACILITIES AND STRUCTURES FOR COMMERCIAL RECREATION SERVICES AT SMITH GULCH IN IDAHO, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; H.R. 4489, TO DESIGNATE MEMORIALS TO THE SERVICE OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN WORLD WAR I, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, "WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL ACT OF 2014"; AND H.R. 4527, TO REMOVE A USE RESTRICTION ON LAND FORMERLY A PART OF ACADIA NATIONAL PARK THAT WAS TRANSFERRED TO THE TOWN OF TREMONT, MAINE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Tuesday, June 10, 2014
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation
Committee on Natural Resources
Washington, DC

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:01 a.m., in room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Rob Bishop [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Bishop, McClintock, Tipton, LaMalfa, Smith; Grijalva, and Cartwright.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. This hearing is going to come to order ahead of time. Mr. Grijalva is on his way, but we will do some audibles as time goes on here.

The Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulations is meeting to hear testimony on a wide variety of bills. Under the rules, the opening statements are limited to the Chairman and Ranking Member. However, we ask unanimous consent to include any other Member's opening statement in the record. I also ask unanimous consent that Members who are not of the full committee or the subcommittee be allowed to sit on the dais and take part in the proceedings.

[No response.]

Mr. BISHOP. And, hearing no objections, we are going to do that.

Today's hearing is going to deal with several different panels, and we are doing it in a different order to try and actually make hearings meaningful. Stupid idea.

So we are going to do bill by bill, in which case we will hear the testimony of a bill and ask the questions before we move on to the next piece of legislation, with one caveat to that. Mr. Michaud from Maine has another obligation from when he was scheduled, so I am actually going to take his testimony, his bill first. We will deal with that, and then we will move on to the Walden bill.

So, the gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes. And then, when Mr. Grijalva is here, if he has an opening statement we will add that opening statement for the record. I will not have an opening statement.

You are on.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, A
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MAINE**

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank Ranking Member Grijalva, as well as members of the subcommittee, for holding this hearing on H.R. 4527. Also really appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your taking me out of order, as you know I have to manage a veterans bill coming up at the same time I was supposed to be here for this bill. I also want to thank Chairman Hastings and Ranking Member DeFazio for their leadership.

H.R. 4527 would make a simple change to ensuring that a community in my district can continue to use land formerly owned by Acadia National Park. In 1950 Congress conveyed a track of land from the park to the Town of Tremont, specifically for the purpose of building and maintaining a school. The conveying deed contained a clause requiring the land to be transferred to the National Park Service if it was ever used for non-school purposes.

Unfortunately, what had been best for the Park Service and the community in 1950 might not be best for the town in 2014. Today, as Tremont and surrounding communities are facing declining enrollment, the town has explored merging its elementary school with neighboring Southwest Harbor. Under the terms of the original conveyance, should the town close the school, the land would be transferred back to the Federal Government. Complicating the situation is legislation passed by Congress in 1986 establishing a per-

manent boundary for Acadia National Park. The boundary established did not include the track of land containing the school. As a result, if Tremont were to stop using the land, it would be transferred to GSA.

My legislation simply removes current use restriction on the land, which would allow Tremont to continue to utilize the property it has been maintaining for 64 years. Acadia National Park has expressed a strong support for the bill, and the GSA has communicated to my office that it would not oppose the effort to allow Tremont to keep the land.

This simply is common-sense legislation that would ensure that my constituents can continue to use this land for community purposes, as the local residents see fit. I ask the committee to support this simple fix to allowing the community of Tremont to continue to use this land that has been part of the community for more than six decades.

And let me again express my sincere gratitude to the Chairman and Ranking Member for bringing this bill before the subcommittee, and for an opportunity to speak today.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Are there any questions?

[No response.]

Mr. BISHOP. I thank you for bringing the bill here. To be honest, you have a tough row to hoe in this particular bill, because it is logical, it makes sense, it is the right thing to do. That is something we don't do in government. But I like the bill, I support it fully. And thank you for being here.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. Let me move to—I really—nothing personal. I would really not like to go any—because the gentleman from Maine had another engagement, so he decided to check that box and get it out of the way. I would like not to do anything more until Mr. Grijalva is here.

But since he is here already, we can go forward with the next bill.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. Fine, make me look stupid, see if I care. No, that is fine.

Before Mr. Grijalva has a chance to sit down—I don't know if he has an opening statement he wants to make for the record.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Just submit it for the record, if there is no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. All right, and I appreciate that.

We will then move on to the next one. Mr. Walden's bill, H.R. 4272, Mr. Walden is here with the dais. He will be recognized first.

We also have at the panel, I believe, Steve McClure from Union County Board of Commissioners and Ms. Leslie Weldon from the Forest Service. I understand, Ms. Weldon, you also have a plane to catch. So after this testimony, and if you would like to give quick testimony on the Simpson bill, please leave us whenever you would like to.

So, with that, we will go to bill H.R. 4272. Mr. Walden, you are recognized for 5 minutes to introduce the bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Walden and Weldon.

Mr. BISHOP. Yes.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. GREG WALDEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. WALDEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Grijalva, for allowing me to testify on this bill, H.R. 4272, the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act. I look forward to working with the committee as you, hopefully, move forward to mark this up and bring it to the full Floor.

Over half of Oregon's land—53 percent, to be exact—is controlled by the Federal Government. And in many counties it can be much higher, just as the national forests have historically played a significant role in providing timber jobs that were the pillars of rural economies. Access to these forests now is a cultural and social mainstay, as well. It is what we do out in the West.

Local residents accessing these forests are camping, hunting, fishing, cutting firewood, collecting berries, doing what we do, enjoying their families, generation after generation. These activities are a way of life in rural America, and certainly in the rural West.

In eastern Oregon, the Wallowa Whitman National Forest Travel Management Plan is really what prompted this legislation, and similar planning failures along the way that caused me to introduce this bill. From the beginning, local communities and volunteers dedicated countless hours of personal time traveling, documenting the roads, communicating their needs to agency officials. But at the end of the process they developed comments and put forth suggestions on roads that weren't being used, that could be closed, but also pointed out roads that are popular, necessary, and needed to remain open.

In 2012, when agency officials rolled out the final plan, more than 4,000 miles of roads were slated for closure—4,000 miles on a forest where a quarter of the land, some 600,000 acres, is already designated wilderness. You can't drive there. In Wallowa County alone, over 70 percent of the national forest is already shut off to motorized recreation—70 percent of the national forest already shut down.

In what amounted to an assault on good process and rural traditions on public lands, it was clear to those who participated in the process that the Forest Service had largely, if not entirely, ignored the thoughtful and deliberate input that they got in this planning process. Having faced years of declining timber harvest and the resulting unemployment and, frankly, rural poverty created by lack of management on our Federal lands, the agency, frankly, ignored local citizens. And at one point, close to 1,000 citizens in a small rural county—or three counties, in this case—turned out to protest the arrogance of the Forest Service.

And I don't use that term lightly. And Ms. Weldon and I go back a long ways when she was on the Deschutes Forest. This was a travesty. I got involved, I heard from the county commissioners, I called the Region 6 supervisor. Frankly, I raised hell about it, because the good process that should occur in public policy had been rejected.

At the end—and I know you will reference this in your testimony—I would not characterize what the Forest Service did as an

example of how the public process worked. Because, in the end, you ended up having to remove the local forest supervisor from her position, and then you pulled back the plan—both of which needed to happen, by the way, but that is not how good public policy should move forward.

Hopefully, we have learned from this lesson and that, going forward, we can have a different process, which is what led me to introduce—write and introduce this bill. We have support from five counties, seven forest user groups that I would like to enter into the record without objection, Mr. Chairman. This legislation simply puts a stop to what I see as a flawed travel management planning rule that applies a one-size-fits-all approach for road management on every community.

I actually chaired an oversight hearing on this issue back in about 2005 or 2006, when young Mr. Crandell had hair, and was the counsel on this committee. And we looked at these issues, because we wanted to maintain this access to what is left of the forest we can access. And I am just telling you I know it has worked out in some areas. In a lot of my district people are furious that their whole lifestyle is being shut down. County commissioners—and you will hear from Mr. McClure—say, “Look, we’ve got to be able to access these forests for rescue, for fire fighting, and for our people.” And it has been a real fight that didn’t need to exist.

President Theodore Roosevelt said—and I quote—“We shall succeed, not by preventing the use, but by making the forests of use to the settler, the rancher, the miner, the man who lives in the neighborhood.” It seems that we have lost our way from that multiple use vision for the great forest reserves, and have lost sight of the important role local communities need to be able to play in this process.

H.R. 4272 provides an opportunity to move back to that idea by putting our local communities in an important driver’s seat when it comes to accessing and managing our public forests. I look forward to working with the Administration to find something that gets a better balance than we see today in many parts of rural America.

Mr. Chairman, representing these local communities and speaking specifically on the need for this legislation, I am really pleased to have the opportunity to introduce Union County Commissioner Steve McClure. Steve and the residents of Union County that he represents so effectively, so ably, so capably, were at the heart of the Wallowa Whitman travel management planning process in a responsible, thoughtful way, where they actively engaged in the process only to have their input then ignored by the decision the Forest Service made.

So, I think you will find his testimony quite helpful in this debate so we get back to a better balance of having local input really matter in the process, and a western way of life of accessing America’s public lands restored.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your courtesy and your indulgence.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HON. GREG WALDEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF OREGON ON H.R. 4272

Thank you, Chairman Bishop, Ranking Member Grijalva and members of the committee, for the opportunity to testify today in support of H.R. 4272, the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act.

I look forward to working with the committee to mark up this bill and move it promptly to the Floor for final consideration.

Over half of Oregon's land, 53 percent to be exact, is controlled by the Federal Government, and in many counties this number can be much higher. Just as the National Forests have historically played a significant role in providing timber jobs that were the pillars of rural economies, access to these forests is a cultural and social mainstay as well.

Local residents accessing these forests are camping, hunting, fishing, cutting firewood or collecting berries in the same places their families have visited for several generations, and often depend on these public lands for their livelihood. These activities are a way of life in rural Oregon; yet with the onslaught of national monuments, roadless areas, wilderness, and the Forest Services' travel management rule, it seems access constantly is being restricted. And far too often restrictions are put in place while overlooking the uses and needs of the local community.

In eastern Oregon, the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest's travel management plan is one of the best examples of how these processes have pushed forward while ignoring local communities along the way.

From the beginning, local counties and volunteers dedicated countless hours of personal time traveling, documenting roads, and communicating their needs to agency officials. At the end of the process, they developed comments and put forth suggestions on roads that weren't being used and could be closed, but also pointed out roads that are popular, necessary, and needed to remain open.

In 2012, when agency officials rolled out the final plan, over 4,000 miles of road were slated for closure, on a forest where a quarter of the land, 600,000 acres, is already designated wilderness. In Wallowa County alone, well over 70 percent of the National Forest is already shut off to motorized recreation. In what amounted to an assault on good process and rural traditions on public lands, it was clear to those who participated in the process that the Forest Service had largely, if not entirely, ignored their thoughtful and deliberate input.

Having faced years of declining timber harvest and the resulting unemployment and poverty at the hand of the Federal Government and agency bureaucrats, the local communities didn't take this lying down. They pulled together and organized. At one point close to 1,000 people attended a meeting to learn how to effectively appeal the plan.

The Forest Service has since pulled their plan back, but will approach this again. Hopefully they have learned from the past, but issues with travel management planning on other forests in Oregon and across the country suggest otherwise.

Since the plan was pulled backed, I have worked with county commissioners and the local residents who enjoy driving, riding, camping, cutting firewood and picking berries on their National Forest to craft this legislation to ensure local communities have a say in forest access decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the letters of support for this legislation from five counties and seven forest user groups be entered into the record. I appreciate their support and their time, effort and feedback in helping craft legislation that meets the local communities' needs.

This legislation simply puts a stop to the flawed travel management planning rule that applied a one-size-fits-all approach for road management on every community. For future proposals that result in a road closure or access restriction, it requires the Forest Service to consult during the planning process, and seek concurrence from the counties within which the road closure occurs, and the neighboring counties, before the project can be implemented.

Doing so levels the playing field and ensures that the local residents and communities, those most affected by these management decisions, have a strong say and aren't ignored in the process.

President Theodore Roosevelt said "We shall succeed, not by preventing the use, but by making the forests of use to the settler, the rancher, the miner, the man who lives in the neighborhood . . ." It seems we have lost our way from that multiple use vision for the great forest reserves and some have lost sight of the important role of local communities in this process. H.R. 4272 provides an opportunity to move back to that idea by putting our local communities back in the driver's seat when it comes to accessing and managing our public forests.

Representing these local communities and speaking specifically on the need for this legislation, I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to introduce Union County Commissioner Steve McClure. Steve and the residents of Union County that he represents were at the heart of the Wallowa-Whitman travel management planning process, where they actively engaged in the process only to have their input ignored. I look forward to hearing Commissioner McClure's testimony and thank him for making the trip here to testify.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Ms. Weldon, we will turn to you next for the Forest Service recommendation. And, once again, you are testifying on a couple of bills. You don't need to take 5 minutes on each of them. Be judicious. You are recognized.

STATEMENT OF LESLIE A.C. WELDON, DEPUTY CHIEF, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ms. WELDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, Congressman Walden, for inviting me here today to testify regarding two bills affecting the national forests.

Many visitors to America's national forests—for many of them, motorized access represents an integral part of their recreation experience. People come to the national forests to ride on roads and trails in pick-up trucks, ATVs, motorcycles, and a variety of other conveyances. We see something new every day. Motor vehicles are a legitimate and appropriate way for people to access and enjoy the national forests in the right places, and with proper management.

The Travel Management Rule of 2005 was developed to address the growing popularity and capability of off-highway vehicles, and to continue to provide these opportunities while sustaining the health of National Forest System lands and resources.

On a national scale, it is critical that we continue to manage the National Forest System for multiple uses, including responsible recreation, while conserving these great resources for future generations. The Administration opposes H.R. 4272 because it would impair the agency's ability to manage National Forest System lands and resources in a safe, effective, and efficient way.

Under the Travel Management Rule, travel management decisions are made by the local forest supervisor or district ranger, and the rule requires a broad spectrum of interested and affected citizens to be able to provide their input and to be involved, as well as tribal governments, in making these management decisions. This approach has seen great success in the vast majority of our national forests.

And, Congressman Walden, I acknowledge that this has not been the case for the Wallowa Whitman National Forest in your district. The Forest Service should have fostered much better collaboration in developing our Travel Management Plan in Eastern Oregon and, by extension, listened to you, respected, and really done a deep level engagement on the great input that was developed and received by the community. And I wanted to stress that our agency has heard your concerns loud and clear.

The current forest supervisor on the Wallowa Whitman Forest is re-assessing the travel management decision in response to public input, and we are committed to working with your office and with

the local communities to improve how we cooperate with local groups and governments to manage the forests in your district.

Across the System we have engaged with our stakeholders to incorporate their comments into implementation of the travel management rule. On the Dixie National Forest in Southern Utah, for example, each road section was reviewed by employees, a citizen's working group, interested public and cooperating government agencies, as they established their road system under the Travel Management Rule.

On the Deschutes and Ochoco Forests, the agency worked with a chartered Federal advisory committee, as well as interested public, to develop a strategy for implementing the rule. And the advisory committee, you know, in and of itself represented a broad spectrum of interests, including local government officials, tribes, business owners, interested public groups, Federal agencies. And they provided recommendations that were used to lay a framework for how the proposed action would be developed in a subsequent analysis.

H.R. 4272 would undercut the significant work already completed during the process of obtaining public input and coordinating with all of these entities for making travel management decisions. About 90 percent of our administrative units across the system have completed implementation of Subpart B of the travel rule, which provides a national framework for local Forest Service units to use in designating a system of roads, trails, and other areas for motorized use. And we are on track for, hopefully, achieving completion of Subpart B on all units by the end of next fiscal year.

Additionally, about 35 percent of the units have completed or nearly completed the requisite travel analysis that will support implementation of Subpart A of the rule.

I would like to express that we are committed to working with Representative Walden and Congress to ensure the best possible management of the forest lands, in conjunction with the interests of the local community.

And briefly on the Administration's position on H.R. 4283, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, we are looking forward to work with Congressman Simpson on the new proposed language, and I am available now to answer any questions you have. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Weldon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LESLIE A.C. WELDON, DEPUTY CHIEF, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON H.R. 4272 AND H.R. 4283

H.R. 4272—FOREST ACCESS IN RURAL COMMUNITIES ACT

Many National Forest visitors use motor vehicles to access the National Forests, whether for recreation, commercial purposes, or the other multiple uses of National Forest System (NFS) lands. For many visitors, motor vehicles represent an integral part of their recreational experience. People come to National Forests to ride on roads and trails in pickup trucks, ATVs, motorcycles, and a variety of other conveyances. Motor vehicles are a legitimate and appropriate way for people to enjoy their National Forests—in the right places, and with proper management. The Travel Management Rule of 2005 was developed to meet the growing popularity and capabilities of Off Highway Vehicles (OHVs), and continue to provide these opportunities while sustaining the health of NFS lands and resources.

The Travel Management Rule has three subparts, dealing with overall roads analysis, management of the road system, and management of over-snow vehicles. Subpart A of the Travel Management Rule requires identification of the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of NFS lands. Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule of 2005 provides a national framework for local Forest Service units to use in designating a system of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use as the Agency moves toward a road system that can be sustainably maintained and that minimizes environmental impacts. The goal of Subpart B is to secure a wide range of recreation opportunities while ensuring the best possible care of the land. Subpart C of the Travel Management Rule provides for designation of routes and areas for over-snow vehicle use.

Under the Travel Management Rule, travel management decisions are made by the forest supervisor or district ranger, and the rule provides for involving a broad spectrum of interested and affected citizens, other State and Federal agencies, and tribal governments in making travel management decisions.

H.R. 4272 would prohibit implementation and enforcement of all subparts of the Travel Management Rule on all NFS lands derived from the public domain; it would require consultation with affected county governments in making travel management decisions under all subparts of the Travel Management Rule and decisions affecting non-motorized access on public domain NFS lands; and it would require concurrence of each affected county for implementation of travel management decisions and decisions affecting non-motorized access on public domain NFS lands.

The Administration opposes H.R. 4272 because it would impair the agency's ability to manage NFS lands and resources safely, effectively, and efficiently.

Specifically, the bill would undercut the significant work already completed during the process of obtaining public input and coordinating with Federal, State, county, and tribal governments in making travel management decisions. Approximately 90 percent of administrative units have already completed implementation of Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule. Designations are displayed on motor vehicle use maps, which show the public where and when they may operate motor vehicles on NFS lands. The agency is on track to achieve implementation on all units by the end of this fiscal year.

Additionally, approximately 35 percent of units have completed or nearly completed the requisite travel analysis that will support implementation of Subpart A. The travel analysis does not effect any changes on the ground, including road closures. Travel analysis for Subpart A is expected to be completed on all units by the close of Fiscal Year 2015.

In the specific case identified by Representative Walden—designation of routes and areas for motor vehicle use in the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest—the Forest Supervisor has agreed to reassess the travel management decision in response to public input, thus illustrating the agency's response to public involvement and the impact of public involvement on the designation process.

The bill could preclude the Forest Service from enforcing public safety prohibitions and restrictions on NFS roads, such as speed, load and weight limits, closures during forest fires, and prohibitions on operating a motor vehicle carelessly and recklessly. Additionally, some travel management decisions involve other programs. Curtailing implementation and enforcement of travel management decisions could therefore affect ongoing programs in other disciplines because of interdependent NEPA decisions and Endangered Species Act consultation.

The consultation requirements in the bill are duplicative. All subparts of the Travel Management Rule provide for involvement of a broad spectrum of interested and affected citizens, other State and Federal agencies, and tribal governments in making travel management decisions.

Moreover, the bill's concurrence requirements would significantly delay or prevent implementation of future individual travel management decisions needed to protect NFS lands and resources, address use conflicts, and provide for public safety. It would be difficult to obtain concurrence from even one county, but "affected county" as defined in the bill includes a county that contains NFS lands affected by a travel management decision, as well as a county adjacent to that county. To illustrate the scope of the concurrence requirement, there are six counties adjacent to Representative Walden's Umatilla County. Four of those are in Oregon, and two are in Washington. Therefore, to implement travel management decisions affecting Umatilla County, it would be necessary to get concurrence from seven counties.

To the extent H.R. 4272 would apply only to public domain NFS lands and not to acquired NFS lands, the bill would result in inconsistent management of NFS lands.

This bill is not needed because the 2005 Travel Management Rule provides for dynamic management of the forest transportation system. Access can be changed or

otherwise managed as needed to address issues that are important to the public and the ecosystem, including issues raised by affected counties.

H.R. 4283—TO AMEND THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today on H.R. 4283, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

The Administration opposes H.R. 4283 because it discriminates between the businesses operating within the Main Salmon Wild River Corridor and would place an undue financial burden on the public for the operation of a private enterprise. We hope to work with Representative Simpson to find a solution that is mutually beneficial to his constituents and the Forest Service.

More than 160 rivers in 38 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico comprise the National Wild and Scenic River System. More than 11,000 river miles are protected reflecting tremendous geographic diversity, from the remote rivers of Alaska, Idaho and Oregon to rivers threading through the rural countryside of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Ohio.

Smith Gulch is located within the Main Salmon Wild River corridor, located within the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness in Idaho. Both the Wild River and Wilderness were designated as such by the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 1132). The Act mandates that the Main Salmon River corridor be managed according to the requirements of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Public Law 108-447, enacted in 2004, amended the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1274(a)(24)(D), and directed that the Forest Service continue to authorize the established use and occupancy of three commercial recreation services within the Main Salmon River Corridor, including the services at Smith Gulch. Such continued authorization is to be subject to such reasonable regulation as the Secretary deems appropriate, including rules that would provide for termination for non-compliance, and if terminated, reoffering the site through a competitive process.

The facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho are authorized and operated under a Term Special Use permit to River of No Return Lodge, Inc. (Permit #NFK249). The permit is authorized under the authority of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended July 28, 1956, (16 U.S.C. 497). This permit is issued with provisions and terms similar to those of recreation facilities throughout the National Forest System. The permit takes into account the location and surroundings of facilities and improvements, the public values affected by such an operation, and any specific public health and safety concerns. Through such authorizations, the responsibility for a fairly offered, high quality outdoor recreation service is shared by the Forest Service, which represents the public at large, and the private business enterprise.

H.R. 4283 would require the public to bear more of the cost of providing recreation services in the operation of a private business, with the Forest Service bearing the cost of environmental analysis. Under the existing approach, regulations directing the assignment of costs are found in 36 CFR 251.58, with Forest Service policy in FSH 2709.11 Chapter 20. These regulations direct the assessment and collection of fees to recover agency processing and monitoring costs for new and existing authorizations. This legislation as written does not explain why the agency should bear the costs of a privately provided recreation service in this location.

The Forest Service has in place appropriate policies to accommodate the needs of a recreation service business operating at this location. Consistent with statutory guidance, the policies allow for such facilities and structures needed to provide the authorized recreation services. Smith Gulch operates under these policies and requirements; just as other similarly authorized businesses within the Main Salmon Wild River Corridor.

As evidenced by the proclamation of June 2014 as Great Outdoors Month, the Forest Service recognizes and fully embraces its mission to provide high quality outdoor recreation services to the public. I encourage the operators of the recreation service business at Smith Gulch to work with the appropriate local Forest Service officials to resolve any issues related to their utilizing existing agency regulations, policies and authorities.

I would like to thank the Chairman and committee members for inviting me to testify on this issue, and I welcome any questions you may have for me at this time.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Commissioner McClure, we are happy to have you here.

Mr. MCCLURE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. BISHOP. You are now recognized on the Walden bill.

**STATEMENT OF STEVE MCCLURE, COMMISSIONER, UNION
COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

Mr. MCCLURE. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the committee. My name is Steve McClure—oh, excuse me.

Mr. BISHOP. Let me interrupt, Commissioner. I appreciate that.

Ms. Weldon, whenever you need to go, you are free to go.

Mr. MCCLURE. OK.

Mr. BISHOP. Commissioner, go ahead.

Mr. MCCLURE. All right, thank you. I have been a commissioner in Union County for 24 years. I am the second-longest-sitting commissioner in the State of Oregon. I have been through the wars.

I guess for me to describe the process that occurred in the Wallowa Whitman Forest would probably be a wonderful war story, it would probably take 2 hours to tell. I have 5 minutes, so I can't tell the war story. But I guess the best way for me to characterize it, it would be a study in the wrong way to do it. OK? If you want to know how to do it wrong, you need to come and look at how it was done in the Wallowa Whitman.

Essentially, if you look at what the Wallowa Whitman situation was, when the Umatilla National Forest did their plan, they implemented travel management. The Wallowa Whitman did not. And that created a situation where you had two forests, side by side on Interstate 84, and if you were coming from Walla Walla or any place that has to do with recreation, you went to the forest that allowed you to do whatever you wanted to do, essentially. So there was a huge emphasis on the Wallowa Whitman for this kind of recreation, not only from the community, but from outside the community.

It was very clear that Steve Ellis was sent to do travel management. The chief had talked to Steve and said, "That is one of the jobs that we expect you to do. We know it is going to be difficult, but we have faith in you to do it." So they initiated the process. The first step in the process was to close all management level one roads across the board, just all of them.

The problem was the Forest Service really didn't know the status of those roads. And they went to the counties and said, "Look, you know, this is our initial proposal, but we also understand that this is an important issue to your communities, and we invite you to take a look at these roads and then come back to us with suggestions of where we need to make changes, and we would certainly consider them. This is our process, this is the normal Forest Service process, don't be afraid of it, go do it."

So, that is what we did. Wallowa County had 30 volunteers that spent two summers with their own vehicles, their own gas, and went out and looked at over 1,000 roads. They had a 17-question questionnaire that they answered on every one of those roads, all right? And they made a determination that almost 47 percent of those roads were already closed, had been closed naturally. They were gone. So they came up with the proposal—they said, "Well, the roads that aren't there, we will give those up, but we really think we need to maintain the level of the roads that we have now."

Union County actually concurred with that, that was the position that we took. To be honest with you, we did not start as soon as Wallowa County did. We kind of dug in our heels and said not only no, but hell no. But we were informed that if we didn't participate, we weren't going to get anything. So we, in the second year, did participate. And we found about the same results. I didn't provide those as attachments, but I have them. If you want to read them, you can see road after road that was closed, barricaded, so on and so forth.

So, I can go through all the details, but, actually, what happened was, when the decision was made, a good friend of mine who was the ranger—no longer works for the Forest Service, but was the La Grande ranger—called me 2 weeks before the decision came out and said, "Steve, County didn't get a damn thing out of this." He said, "I argued for 2 weeks," and he said, "You got nothing."

OK. We asked for four specific things that we wanted that we had identified that we needed, very simple things. And they are in my testimony. I mean they were loop roads, they were roads that were very simple. We got none of them. So the outcry that you got from the public—the congressman mentioned it—I have never seen in my 24 years the size of the outcry that that community had. It wasn't what the commissioners did that changed this; it was the people in the community, OK? Their values, their belief, their use.

You need to understand what has happened to a lot of these forests. The economic piece has gone away. Now we are taking away the recreational piece. And those people absolutely resent it.

Now, I want to spend just a few minutes to the bill. You know, it appears, if you first look at the bill, this gives county commissioners a free pass. All right? Gives them a veto. This bill does not give us a veto. We have to have travel management. We are working on a timber sale right now in the Wallowa Whitman, and the issue of travel management has come up, and we are being challenged because we don't have a rule. OK? But it makes commissioners step up to the plate and raise their hand and do it in concurrence.

Right now it is easy for me if the Forest Service—I just say, "Hey, they made the mistake. I didn't." But we have asked for years for that participation, and we are willing to do that participation, and that is what this bill provides for.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McClure follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEVE MCCLURE, UNION COUNTY COMMISSIONER ON
H.R. 4272

Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the subcommittee for the invitation to testify on H.R. 4272. My name is Steve McClure. I have had the honor of serving the citizens of Union County, Oregon for nearly 24 years as a County Commissioner. During that time I have had the opportunity to observe and participate in the changes that have occurred in the management of Natural Resources.

Today I would like to relate to you the experiences of not only Union County, but also of Baker and Wallowa counties as it relates to the process the Forest Service went through to develop the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest Travel Management Plan.

When the Wallowa-Whitman did their last Forest Management Plan, travel management was not included in the plan. At the same time the Umatilla National Forest did their plan and they did include Travel Management except for the Heppner Ranger District. The outcome of those resulted in a situation where two

National Forests side by side on Interstate 84 had two entirely different travel restrictions—one that was extremely limited in access and the other that had no restriction at all as it related to ORV use. As you can well imagine the Forest with no restriction became the preferred recreation site for ORV recreation.

Even though the three National Forests in eastern Oregon, together with the 10 counties in Oregon and Washington, were in the process of developing a new Forest Plan notice came that the Wallowa-Whitman would also do a Travel Management Plan at the same time rather than including it in the ongoing plan process.

The Forest Supervisor of the Wallowa-Whitman made public his proposed conditions which was to close all ML 1 and reduce some ML 2 to ML 1 and at the same time assured the counties and the local communities that it was not going to be the final outcome and invited each of the three counties to examine the proposals and submit changes that the counties wanted.

All three counties then submitted to the Forest Service the changes they wanted to see in the ROD and they were all rejected but a few minor changes in Baker County. (I have included Union County's request and rationale that we submitted as part of the record).

I could spend an hour in telling all the details of what happened but rather than that I would just like to finish by summarizing what I consider to be the major problems and issues with the Travel Management Plan for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

First, this was a top down decision. The decision had already been made with the initial proposal and the counties were involved because of public governmental requirements, but that input was never seriously considered by the decisionmakers. At least some part of the counties' requests could and should have been acceptable.

Second, the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest did not know or represent current conditions as they existed when they made their initial proposal. The counties discovered that almost half of the roads that were proposed for closure were no longer useable because they had naturally grown over.

Finally, the Forest Service clearly exceeded the boundaries of what was acceptable to the Local Communities as demonstrated by the largest rally of opposition to any governmental decision in my 24 years as a County Commissioner.

Our experience with the Wallowa-Whitman Travel Management Plan clearly shows the need for H.R. 4272 which provides a chance to restore local control over these planning processes and ensure that local communities, and their needs and uses are not ignored. It is important that the counties not only participate but that there is an agreement between the Forest Service and the communities.

The following document is part of my testimony and not to be considered an attachment.

UNION COUNTY TRAVEL MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

Union County affords unparalleled recreation opportunities in the vast forests and mountains surrounding the Grande Ronde and Indian Valleys. Thousands of visitors annually hike, explore, photograph, four-wheel, cross-country ski, snowmobile, cut firewood, pick berries and mushrooms, hunt, mountain bike, or just enjoy the panoramic views, peace, quiet, and clean air. Nearly half (45 percent–49 percent) of Union County land area is administered by the Forest Service consisting of Umatilla National Forest but primarily Wallowa Whitman National Forest. Most of these many recreational opportunities take place on Forest Service land and are an intricate part of what makes Union County a great place to live.

The economic benefits of these activities are obvious and substantial; from the hunters and fishermen that stay in our motels and eat in our restaurants, to the mushroom and berry pickers that purchase fuel in our gas stations and supplies in our stores. These activities depend greatly on the ability to easily access our forestland. The true value of access reaches far beyond the economic benefits. To the many individuals that choose to live and work in Union County, the ability to access a favorite spot is part of a heritage handed down from generation to generation. During our committee's work to quantify and qualify the use of our forestland, many stories were related speaking directly to this heritage. Countless citizens recounted stories of how their father took them to this place and their father before them. Rich traditions are developed around simple camps on dead end roads or jeep and OHV trails that take you farther "off the beaten path". Secret berry and mushroom patches are passed down from generation to generation. These experiences are the foundation of what defines us as a people in northeast Oregon and an intricate part of our heritage. An act as simple as closing a single road may lose these traditions forever. The first conclusion the County's travel management committee would put forth is that it is impossible to capture and quantify the social value of these

traditions and document specific access to them. The approximate 25,000 citizens of Union County utilize many different areas for many different uses. How is it possible to capture and quantify each citizen's use, and accurately represent the social value to that individual? Social values will absolutely be impacted by reducing the level of motorized access. Reducing access in any given area will impact those that have grown up recreating in that area.

Instead what would greatly benefit the many precious resources in our forests would be to enforce those closures that have already been made. The inability of existing closures to be maintained and enforced calls into question the ability of the Forest Service to enforce the many additional closures proposed. During conversation with the Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers it has become clear that little to no additional staffing will be added as a result of this process. It was also stated that if additional staff is added, they will not be assigned to this area. It has also been made clear that the proposed closures will not be physical closures, but merely a road will be indicated closed by a chart on the back of a map. Given the limited number of law enforcement currently available, the lack of additional law enforcement foreseen in the future, and the fact that roads will not be physically closed, Union County views the implementation of more restrictive options as unsustainable and unrealistic.

Permitted access, especially collecting firewood, will be greatly impacted by reducing access. Reducing the number of access roads will largely serve to concentrate those that take part in this activity. The same could be said of many other activities including but not limited to hunting, berry picking and mushrooming. The ability to have a positive and productive experience while taking part in these activities will be greatly impacted by reduced access. The more users that are concentrated along limited access routes, the more difficult the activity will become resulting in both the degradation of social values as well as a reduced ability to harvest fuel wood as well as berries, mushroom or game.

It is certainly true that not all Union County citizens value motorized access as the priority recreational experience. Although, many of these users utilize various forest roads to access the roadless areas. For those that value what has been termed "quiet recreation" there are currently large roadless areas and areas of regulated vehicle use. In Union County these areas include the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, the La Grande Watershed and the Dry Beaver-Ladd Canyon Travel Management Area. In adjacent counties additional roadless areas include the North Fork Umatilla Wilderness, the Wenaha Tucannon Wilderness, The Baker Watershed, The North Fork John Day Wilderness, and the Hells Canyon Recreation Area. In the Wallowa Whitman alone approximately one-fourth of the management area is currently wilderness (586,729 acres) and over 110,000 acres of wilderness lie in Union County.

The threat of catastrophic wild fire is very real in Union County. Although the draft EIS allows for access to all roads for emergency response, the reality is that upon discontinuing active use many roads will be reclaimed by nature. As these roads currently provide access to fire apparatus, fewer roads will certainly result in less access by engines crews. Roads can certainly be reopened however this will cost valuable time during initial attack while crews wait for the proper equipment to respond and open a road. The county believes it is unrealistic to expect roads will be reopened anytime a fire breaks out near closed roads. More realistically these fires will be dealt with using less effective crews rather than engine crews or roads will not be opened until fires become large enough to warrant the cost and allocation of resources.

For the reasons detailed above as well as the many reasons submitted independently by the local forests users, Union County supports Draft Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative.

Since the release of the draft EIS it has been made clear to Union County that Alternative 3 will not meet the many stringent requirements applied by the various resource agencies and planning guidelines. As a result the County has spent hundreds of volunteer hours attempting to evaluate the current Forest Service road system. These evaluations were completed by one group during one season. Through no lack of effort on the part of these volunteers, the data is limited and incomplete. For example, by only surveying through one time of year it is difficult to document the changes in use during other seasons. Additionally, we were unable to complete all road systems, however we believe a good sample has been established from which a precedent can be created and applied forest wide. Union County completed a road survey in which 283 roads totaling 236 miles were identified as physically closed, inaccessible or unable to locate (see attachment 1). It is the County's assertion that prior to closing additional open roads the Forest Service should first remove all the closed and inaccessible roads from the inventory. A substantial number

of roads could be removed to meet the many management requirements without impacting the current access. It is only after these roads have been removed from consideration that a true and accurate picture of the existing road system can be gained.

During this survey many current uses were identified (see attachment 2). As stated above, one result that was made clear during the survey is that it is impossible to document the social value of each individual road to all the citizens of Union County. Attachment 2 should be considered an example of the myriad of uses that take place on all the road systems in the forest.

There are a few areas the County would like to specifically callout as priority areas to maintain access. The first is the Five Points Creek OHV area (see attachment 3). As the Forest Service is aware the County is currently developing the Mount Emily Recreation Area (MERA).

Discussions have been underway to link MERA in to the existing Forest Service OHV trail system. The attached map and data details an existing OHV route that crosses the Five Points Creek at the Camp One Crossing. It is the County's opinion that this crossing and the connecting trails are critical to access all the open and available trails on the west side of Five Points Creek. This crossing and associated trails will allow a substantial expansion of the current Forest Service OHV <= 50" trail system eventually benefiting both the Forest Service and MERA.

The second priority area is the South Fork Catherine Creek Trail (see attachment 4). Union County considers this a vital link between the 7787 and 7700 roads. Currently the trail is utilized extensively by OHVs during all times of the year. The Buck Creek area is also used by hunters, berry and mushroom pickers, wood cutters as well as an access point to the Eagle Cap Wilderness. The South Fork Catherine Creek Trail as detailed on the map and the road system in the Buck Creek area are of major social value to the citizens of Union County. The county would propose that the trails system be open year round to OHVs <= 50".

The third priority area is the Dry Beaver-Ladd Canyon and Clear Creek Travel Management Areas. These areas are currently under travel management. It is the opinion of the County that these areas should maintain the current level of access and closures. Since the existing conditions are regulating both off road travel and overall motorized access, the County sees no reason to further limit access. It has been represented to the County that some options allow for this request, i.e. Option 5. However upon close inspection of Option 5 some current green dot roads do not appear on the map such as the 4300500 and 4300300. As we have been led to believe Option 5 maintains the green dot roads as open, all green dot roads should be open under this option.

The fourth priority area is the Breshears OHV Trail system. Since this area is an identified OHV trail area, the County wishes to maintain that area as built, including those Forest Service roads used to access what is currently Forest Capital property. The Breshears system is primarily maintained by the users and is utilized extensively by Union County citizens. Under Option 5 there are loop roads and connectors such as the 6205, 6210090 that are proposed to be closed or the connection is to be severed that will reduce the functionality of the trail system. As this is already a designated OHV area, it should be maintained as such.

According to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement the Travel Management process includes an annual review. It is the hope of Union County that this review be a collaborative process allowing for the reopening of roads found to be of substantial social and economic value. As a part of the annual review process Union County requests that the number and total mileage of roads currently closed and inaccessible be identified as well as those that are closed as a result of the travel management plan. Union County does not believe an accurate current condition has been represented. The County views the review process as vital to rectify the closing of roads that the community finds to be necessary and important for the many reasons listed above.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I appreciate that. We will now have questions to our witnesses on this particular bill.

I am going to yield my time to Mr. Walden, if you have some particular questions of the other two witnesses.

Mr. WALDEN. No, I—thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that, and—allowing me to say a few words.

I think Mr. McClure—Commissioner McClure really summed it up well. And he is not alone. As you go across eastern Oregon, commissioners really want a better relationship with the Forest Service when it comes to these roads. In some cases I have heard from commissioners that have that. But it is so dependent upon who is in that local forest. And it shouldn't be that way. And that is why we wrote this bill to try and make the point and move forward to build better collaboration at the local level.

Because I have to tell you. Steve really stepped up. And his colleagues. And there were other counties around that weren't quite sure they should go down this path, and their local voters and residents weren't sure they should even participate. And so you can imagine what happened when they finally convinced everybody, as did I, "You better participate so you are doing the public process, so you have your input, or else the Forest Service won't be able to evaluate what you suggest," only to find out all that gets thrown out. Now there is no confidence in the system. Now 1,000 people turn out. This isn't downtown Portland, where turning out 1,000 people is no big deal. How many people live in Union County, Steve?

Mr. MCCLURE. Twenty-five thousand.

Mr. WALDEN. Twenty-five thousand. So 1 out of every 25 showing up for a meeting.

Mr. MCCLURE. Yes.

Mr. WALDEN. If that doesn't get your attention—and I had to make calls, and all of that, as well.

And we had to do it, frankly, on the Malheur, when the new forest supervisor or Region 6 supervisor—first place I took him was the Malheur, because the same issues were bubbling up there.

So, it is not just this isolated case. Other places, yes, I would admit it has worked out. And certainly probably in other regions of the country it has worked out. But the feeling that folks I represent have, and that I have deeply is you already locked off X percent per forest on wilderness, roadless, whatever. Now it feels like you are coming back for the rest. And that is what I think has people really upset and concerned.

I don't know anybody who thinks you ought to be able to take an off-road vehicle and just run it across the range and destroy the habitat. There is probably somebody in every case. But that is not what we are about here at all. We want good management. But you also want to be able to access these roads. And it just feels like a few people in an office make the decisions.

So, maybe I could go to Steve for a question, Mr. Chairman, just in terms of this collaboration with the counties, because I know the Administration opposes that piece of this bill.

How do you see—foresee that working? Before they could close a road, they would have to reach out to you. And I know Ms. Weldon, in her testimony, references northeast Oregon. And maybe the way we have worded it would require six counties and two States to sign off. Is that something you think we could work through, Steve?

Mr. MCCLURE. Congressman, Mr. Chair, Congressman, we have been doing that for years in eastern Oregon. You need to understand the relationship that counties have out there. We do not have

a bad relationship. I really need to tell you that. We have been in the process for almost 10 years now, developing a new plan for the three forests in eastern Oregon: the Malheur, the Wallowa Whitman, and the Umatilla. OK? We have planned for 10 years. And we finally have a plan on the street for public comment. And I will be honest with you. The counties were at the table, we were—the 10 counties, 3 in Washington, 7 in Oregon—we were co-conveners. So it is in our culture to do this kind of work.

Now, I will be honest with you. We don't always agree with the Forest Service, but we sit down with the Forest Service at the table. We do it all the time. And my community, we provide a tanker base, we have a relationship constantly with the Forest Service. We work with the Forest Service. We have always worked with the Forest Service. And we worked with the Forest Service on this particular circumstance, we honestly did. We went out and did the survey. My opinion is the Forest Service should never have put the proposal on the table without knowing the condition of those roads to begin with. It shouldn't have been the community's job to go out there and determine which ones were closed and which ones weren't. But that—being that what it may, we did.

So, when you talk about cooperation, yes, we know how to cooperate. We have done it. And it doesn't change what we are doing. I think the important thing to this bill, it honestly brings the commissioners to the table, where they have to make a decision. OK? That is the important piece, all right? We can no longer sit on the sidelines and complain and complain. We now are going to have to have travel management. It is going to go into the courts when we try to do activities. If you don't have travel management, it is going to be required. It is going to require us to negotiate and come up with concurrence with the Forest Service, so that we have buy-in. And that is something that we, as local county commissioners, have wanted for years out there, is that responsibility. And I honestly tell you there are people that don't want that. But that is the position that I think. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I appreciate that. Mr. Grijalva, do you have questions?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you. Chief Weldon, If this bill were to become law, would the Forest Service have to restart the entire travel management process that was required since 2005 under President Bush's administration?

And even though approximately 90 percent of the national forests in the country are now managed under the finalized decision on the rule, any idea, if that process were to start over, what are the costs that would be incurred by the taxpayers at this point?

Ms. WELDON. Thanks, Chairman Grijalva. You know, I am not totally sure what the implications would be, as we would move forward under the Act. The need for the concurrence is the piece that would need to be evaluated. You know, we have decisions that have been made. But without those having been made with concurrence from the commissioners, then we would have to figure out how to go back and open those decisions up to enable that to occur.

So, potentially, it could open the planning process again, because there may be enough difference in conditions and such that would require really digging into those analyses again. So—

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes. The issue of concurrence that is in the legislation?

Ms. WELDON. Yes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Essentially, giving veto power to the counties over Federal decisions. And what does that mean for tribes or other stakeholders that might be involved in that?

Ms. WELDON. Again, I think there is much to be worked out, and we look forward to working with Congressman Walden on that as it relates to the nature of concurrence, and whether that is something that—what weight does that carry in the context of the other involvement of citizens for decisionmaking. So those things are just things that need to be developed further with the bill.

But our real intent is to ensure that we move forward with as strong and close understanding of what the context of this decision means to the local citizens. And that is something that we can do much better at than we have done in this instance.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes. The point of the legislation is to halt the implementation, as part of it. And then, the consequence after that is the concurrence. And—

Ms. WELDON. Correct.

Mr. GRIJALVA [continuing]. Where that all—

Ms. WELDON. Yes. The part about halting is of great concern, because that is something that throws off the work that is in play and being implemented, and could have the potential of stopping us from following through on the portions of the rule that are in play and working well to allow access and to protect the resource.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Well, even the 90 percent, the decisions that have been made, I would suggest under that language is—they are all under question.

Ms. WELDON. That is correct, yes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Commissioner, going back to that roughly 90 percent of the national forest lands in the country are now being managed under the finalized decisions of the rule, see, if the legislation that you are supporting were to become law, all of these plans would be scrapped. And that is a concern.

I understand the difficulties you faced in your community with the Forest Service. But as a taxpayer yourself, would you want to see the rest of the country start over in all those travel management plans that have cost millions of dollars to get to that point, if the language of this legislation is the way it is?

Mr. MCCLURE. Congressman—Mr. Chair, Congressman—

Mr. GRIJALVA. Sure.

Mr. MCCLURE. I would agree with you. It doesn't make sense to go back and start all over. I am not a lawyer. I am not one that can give you a legal opinion. But my opinion is that it is not unreasonable to pass this bill with the understanding, as we go forward, this will be the process. I mean put language in the bill that says, "If you have a travel management in place, you don't have to go back and do it over because of this bill." I have no problem with that. Communities have made it work.

I mean we look at individual communities, and the way they have made it work is fine. We made an honest, good-faith attempt to work with the Forest Service, and it did not work in our community, OK, for a number of reasons. So, to ask concurrence—

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK.

Mr. MCCLURE [continuing]. I don't think is unreasonable, but I agree with you, I don't think it makes any sense to go back and spend the money to do it all over again all over the country.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Commissioner, I think the Deputy Chief said that that process didn't go, in your particular instance, the way it should have gone, and that they look forward to working on a—even a potential restart on some of the issues that you are bringing up. I just think this legislation is so encompassing that the rest of the country, then, has to follow the dictates, based on the situation in your area. And I don't think that is fair. Yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Tipton, you beat me here. Do you have questions for these witnesses?

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. McClure, thanks for taking the time to be here. You could be a county commissioner in Colorado. We are hearing the same complaints throughout our district. We have 54,000 square miles of Colorado, and many of the same challenges and concerns that you are expressing here today we have certainly heard out of our district.

In your opinion, after listening to your testimony and reading through it, was the Forest Travel Management Plan already predetermined before the counties were able to weigh in? Was the decision already made?

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Chair, Congressman, I think that is one of the criticisms, that it—maybe it wasn't, but the outcome appeared that it was. OK?

I mean when you go through the process that we went through, and none of what we had put on the table was considered, you have to believe that it was a top-down decision that came from DC that the Wallowa Whitman would have the management, and this is what it would be. I mean that is the feeling that the community has out there, that this was totally a top-down decision.

Now, can I say that unequivocally? No. But that is the feeling that we had in the community—

Mr. TIPTON. Could you maybe give us a couple of—

Mr. MCCLURE. We were not considered in the process.

Mr. TIPTON. You made some requests, some suggestions for the management plan. Could you just give us a couple of examples of what those requests were to be included?

Mr. MCCLURE. Well, we went with option three, which was considered the Wallowa County option. Wallowa County did a fantastic job of identifying roads. And their position was simply, "OK, the roads that are no longer serviceable, we take them off the list. But we keep the rest of them on the list." All right? "We allow people to use the roads," you know?

These are last-mile roads, they are the ones that get you to your Elk camp, they are the ones that get you to the huckleberry patch, they are the ones that get you to the last mile. And if they are still functioning, we allow them. OK? There is not a lot of cost to them. They are dirt roads. But they are the piece that brings the public into the recreation area. We accepted that.

But we asked for things as simple as to maintain connectivity between private lands and Forest Service lands, you know? Routes that we had—

Mr. TIPTON. That sounds reasonable to me, yes.

Mr. MCCLURE. If you took the Forest Service piece out, the loop route went away.

Mr. TIPTON. Right.

Mr. MCCLURE. I mean what we were asking for was extremely simple, and there were only four specific things that we asked for.

Mr. TIPTON. So you asked for——

Mr. MCCLURE. We got none of the four.

Mr. TIPTON [continuing]. Four specific things. Sounds reasonable to me. What was the response from the Forest Service?

Mr. MCCLURE. From the Forest Service? You know——

Mr. TIPTON. Did they give you an explanation as to why they disregarded the request that you made?

Mr. MCCLURE. I think part of the problem that happened was there was a change in leadership at a crucial time when this happened. The forest supervisor that went through the process went back to work for the BLM in Idaho. We got a new supervisor who I really don't think understood it, and made a decision in total disregard from what the community had made. OK?

If you really want to look at it, that was a huge mistake. OK? It was a personnel change.

Mr. TIPTON. Right.

Mr. MCCLURE. And essentially, the input from the community was totally disregarded.

Mr. TIPTON. Input from the community was totally disregarded.

You know, I am a big believer in having that collaborative process. And Colorado, where we have a lot of public lands, it has worked well, to try to be able to work out some of these issues. But, Ms. Weldon, maybe you could answer for me. We have had Chief Tidwell before us, talking about closing public lands.

We had forest fires out in Colorado in my district, West Fork Complex fire that went through. When I went to the incident command centers, they said that the model that the Forest Service had was completely out the window. This was impacting public safety, not to mention just access into these public lands.

So, can you assure us that, when you are holding these hearings, that you are actually listening? Or is this just eyewash?

Ms. WELDON. I can assure you we are listening. I am listening, and I really appreciate hearing the county commissioner describe what we hold to be very important, that we make better decisions when we make them with the interests of a local community in mind. They are better, but that doesn't mean they are easy.

So, I just want to emphasize to you that what we are talking about here, by way of effective collaboration, is extremely important.

Mr. TIPTON. Well, when we are talking about effective collaboration, four simple requests.

Ms. WELDON. Right, and what I would commit to——

Mr. TIPTON. Simply—and they were disregarded.

Ms. WELDON. Yes, and that——

Mr. TIPTON. Is that listening?

Ms. WELDON. Not in this instance. It was not listening.

Mr. TIPTON. It was not.

Ms. WELDON. And what I——

Mr. TIPTON. But the policy is in place.

Ms. WELDON. Correct. And our policy wasn't followed in that instance. So what I would say is that as we move forward, we need to hear and listen and take into consideration the hard work that the local community did to help us make a decision.

Mr. BISHOP. OK, thank you. Mr. Garcia, you just joined us. Are you up to speed here? Did you want more time before you ask questions?

Mr. GARCIA. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. Mr. McClintock, do you have questions?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have heard from Oregon, you have heard from Colorado. I represent the lion's share of the Sierra Nevada, and my district runs from Truckee, north of Lake Tahoe, through Yosemite Valley, all the way down to Kings Canyon in Fresno County. And I have to tell you, word for word, what Commissioner McClure has said about the sentiments of local officials in his region are what I am hearing constantly from the local officials in my region.

There is a very strong sense that local wishes are not being considered by the Forest Service, and that the Forest Service's maxim of Gifford Pinchot years ago, "Greatest good for the greatest number in the long run," has been radically altered to a policy of "Look, but don't touch."

The widespread shutdown of access roads in our region has severely limited public access. In many cases, local governments have actually volunteered to maintain the roads when the Forest Service has said, "Oh, we just don't have the funding for it," despite the fact they are sitting on one of the most valuable assets the U.S. Government owns, the national forests. Local governments have stepped forward and said, "Fine. We will pay to maintain those roads," and they have been turned down by the Forest Service. It is inexplicable.

Mr. McClure's point is spot on. You have already shut down economic activity on our public lands, which has severely impacted the economies of these local mountain communities. But you have always said, "Well, don't worry about the fact we are shutting down timber, don't worry about the fact we are shutting down minerals. Don't worry, because you will always have recreation." And now you are shutting down the recreational opportunities. The public resents it, it resents it intensely.

You know, 42 percent of California is owned by the Federal Government. In my district I have Alpine County; 96 percent of Alpine County is owned by the U.S. Forest Service. When the Norman and Plantagenet kings declared one-third of the land area of Southern England off limits to commoners, they declared it the Royal Forest, the exclusive preserve of the king, the king's foresters, and the king's favorites, the public resentment was so strong that no fewer than five clauses of Magna Carta were specifically devoted to redressing these grievances. And I have to warn you, as I have been for years now, that that public resentment is building and building in California, obviously also in Colorado, obviously also in Oregon.

The preservation of the public lands for future generations doesn't mean closing them to the current generation. And yet, that

appears to be the overriding policy of the U.S. Forest Service today. And that is not going to be allowed to stand. This is increasingly the attitude of the U.S. Forest Service under this administration. You have been warned and warned and warned of the public resentment that is building. And yet the Forest Service has obstinately proceeded in this exclusionary policy. And I will warn you again. It is not going to be tolerated by the public.

You know, 30 years ago we harvested the excess timber out of the national forests before it could burn. And as one forester said long ago, "The"—sorry, I don't know what—sorry, at least I am not alone.

Mr. BISHOP. We are on the third floor. I don't think the flash flood will hit us.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Anyway, the point I was going to make was that the—when we harvested that—the forester says, you know, all of that excess timber comes out of the forest one way or another. It is either burned out, or it is carried out, but it comes out. When it was carried out we had healthier forests and a thriving economy.

And we had one other thing: a well-maintained timber road system throughout the forests, small groups of foresters spread throughout those forests. When they saw a fire starting on a neighboring ridge, they had the equipment and they had the good fire access roads to get over there and put out that fire before it could spread. That is all gone now, and we are seeing massive forest fires. In my district the rim fire destroying 400 square miles of forest land, and one of the contributing factors is this policy of shutting down the timber roads.

I couldn't agree more with the bill. And I thank you for the time.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. And, once again, after this hearing is over, I want to find out how the Forest Service was able to interrupt his questions.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. It is the government. You manipulate us somewhere. There was a black helicopter around, and you did it some way. I don't know how you did it, but you did it.

Mr. LaMalfa, do you have any questions?

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you could only arrange for that to be in northern California, where we need the water supply, instead of here, for the flood.

Thank you to the panel here. Again, I can echo a lot of the same frustrations and complaints that Mr. McClintock did, Mr. Tipton did, and the reason for Mr. Walden coming forward. I represent the area basically north of Mr. McClintock's district, and we have many county supervisors that express—and the people that have, in the past, until recent years, used the forests and used them wisely but, nonetheless, had the access.

And now what you find—and I get probably more complaints about this—well, except maybe the VA—than anything else, is that the access to the public's land has been denied. A recent policy of travel management or non-travel management has found people with more and more closed gates, very arbitrary. And that is a part of the problem.

Ms. Weldon, when you have a new person that comes in, you have a new attitude. You have a new subjective way of looking at

how this particular unit be managed. And so there is no set rule. So I don't see a thing wrong with this law that Mr. Walden has put forward, this proposal, H.R. 4272, simply requiring that if something—like part of the language, “If it will or can reasonably be expected to alter public assets in the National Forest System lands of the unit, including any change or access,” then it will be subject to a little more closer scrutiny by the local folks, local government. What could possibly be wrong with that, Ms. Weldon?

Ms. WELDON. I think that the law itself is affirming the value and importance of the level of collaboration and connection and engagement we need to have with the local citizens, and that the counties, as a representative, can be of assistance to that.

The complexities come in with whether or not there is a suspension of our ability to implement the current decisions we have in place, and how do we work through or work out the other primary entities affected when it comes to the role that the counties play. And so—

Mr. LAMALFA. What other entities would that be?

Ms. WELDON. There are tribes, there are other stakeholders that may not be associated with the decisions that the counties would make. So I am just saying those are things that we would like to keep working with the committee to be able to resolve, so that—

Mr. LAMALFA. I am sure the tribes can be very effectively worked with on that, similar to the local government. It is another form of government, and I am sure they can be heard very well, but that shouldn't be used as an excuse. The reason that, again, we are so frustrated is that you might get a new forest manager in there, or a current one, that decides, “Hey, this is my forest, and we are going to do it this way.”

Ms. WELDON. And if I could please address that, you know—

Mr. LAMALFA. We have had that attitude. Very, very frustrating in the north.

Ms. WELDON. Yes, and—

Mr. LAMALFA. And it has—

Ms. WELDON. It is a—you know, when we bring leadership in for the national forests, we all need to have the same intent, and that is a core value of working very closely with local communities, and being able to stay consistent with our policy. And we owe that to the communities not to have very distinct swings in intent, because of the—I would say the inherent connection and contract that we have with that local community on how—

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, we certainly owe that in a collaborative process, and we haven't been getting that. It has been very closed off in many cases here. So, I would have to strongly disagree that just because it is already in place doesn't mean we can't go back. Because, you know, Mr. McClure—their group has been very active in the process. Maybe some of the other group supervisors, commissioners, kind of got caught before they really understood what was going on, and the initial decisions were made.

So, I think we would have to have the ability to go back and redo or adjust or modify or slightly tweak—however you want to look at it—the management plan that is in place. Because if you still ask those people in those districts, they are probably still very dissatisfied with their lack of access by the whim of a new administration

or a new manager in that district. So we shouldn't alter this legislation at all. Just because those units have been done or finished—this plan is in place doesn't mean, hey, it is over with.

They need to have that ability to alter a decision that was made. What would you say to that, Mr. McClure?

Mr. MCCLURE. I certainly appreciate what you are saying, Congressman. You know, I am looking at it from my perspective, going forward. I was not involved in the decisions that were made. You make a lot of sense when you make that discussion.

But I would like to comment on the comment about how we get representation from other parts of our community. I need to tell you. Just like you, Congressman, I am elected. OK? I have stood seven times for election in Union County. I lost the first time, all right? I just finished going through my last election here in May. I have a job evaluation every 4 years. If I am not representing that community, I don't continue to do that.

So, to imply that I am a county commissioner—am not—or a county commissioner is not qualified to make those decisions, I dispute that. We are just like anybody else, as an elected official. You know, we represent our communities. So—

Mr. LAMALFA. We are over time, and I will come back to you in the second round here. But I appreciate that, because you probably make a decision closer to your people than anybody can 3,000 miles away in Washington, DC. I will yield back and come to you in the second round. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH [presiding]. Does any Member have any further questions for a second round?

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, let's keep going, then.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. LaMalfa?

Mr. LAMALFA. Are we OK, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SMITH. Proceed.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. McClure, please continue that thought.

Mr. MCCLURE. Yes. So I am sensitive to that argument. Now, don't get me wrong. Everybody in Union County doesn't agree with me, and I understand that, I don't expect that. But I guess, from my perspective, when I stand for election, I get my ticket punched, so to speak, just like you do, Congressman. You stand for election. And we know what that means. You have to put yourself on the line. So that does mean something. And we are the elected representatives of that county.

I don't think there is any idea that we are going to ignore other functions. You are not going to get complete agreement anyway. But I will guarantee you that I represent the interests of Union County, what the people of Union County believe.

And I think the important point to consider is there is a saying in politics, "You can mess with someone's vocation, but don't touch their avocation." And that is what you have done here. OK? We have taken away the timber supplies, we are closing the mills down. But now we have gone the second step. OK? We have gone to the point where we are impacting what people do out of pleasure, out of their hearts, and everything else. And it is not acceptable in these communities. It is becoming less and less acceptable. And that is exactly my concern.

Now, if we look at the issue of cross-road travel and all those other issues, I will tell you that Union County obtained 3,800 acres that we made into an ATV park. OK? We got the money from the State of Oregon, the Parks Department. One of the first questions that we had to answer was how were we going to deal with off-road travel with ATVs. And you know what we did? We decided we were not going to allow it. All right? And the community accepted that. And the community understands that. They will accept those kinds of things that make sense.

And we are not the only ones that have done that. Morrow County has one that is 9,000, almost 10,000 acres, and they have done the same thing. So you can do this responsibly, listening to——

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, you need to give people an outlet, and they find that there is no outlet. State of California, they had their—what is called the Green Sticker Fee doubled with the consent of the off-road community some years ago to put more money into the fund to open off-road and maintain off-road facilities. That money was swiped by the State legislature and moved into other areas. And so, here we are, off-roaders, holding the bag once again for a lie.

And so, this Walden legislation, I think, is perfectly in line with having a better say by your local government to determine does it make sense for your community, is it right that we can get together and discern where it is appropriate and where it isn't. We are finding just locked gates. We are finding people that approach those gates, they park their vehicle, heck, you've got people over-zealously fining them for the way they are parking their vehicles in front of the locked gate. So, it is making people very angry in these districts like mine, Mr. McClintock's, and probably the others, as well.

And, Ms. Weldon, there needs to be a heck of a lot more connectivity. So you coming in here and saying you are opposed to this legislation, I don't have a lot of sympathy, because it hasn't been very collaborative up to this point.

And I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Mr. Grijalva?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two quick questions.

Deputy Chief, going back to the point I think you started to discuss, could this legislation put the Federal Government in a potential violation of its trust and treaty responsibility to tribes? Say, hypothetically, if a proposed action is needed to meet treaty obligations such as off-reservation hunting, fishing, or the protection of a sacred site.

Ms. WELDON. If the legislation requires a cessation of implementation of the decisions that have already been made, then I would say it does create a concern for those tribal entities who have entered into the government-to-government consultation, as part of how the decisions were made.

So, it opens that up again and again. That is something we would like to work with the committee on, to get clarity on how we would move forward. But it does open up the need for us to revisit those decisions, and to make sure we are on track with the outcomes that were agreed upon with the tribes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Commissioner, just a question about how far does one extend the input. Because this legislation elevates counties, to some extent, above all other stakeholders. That is why I asked the question about tribes.

Let's say, hypothetically, vacationing families from Portland, they want to weigh in on the planning process for the national forest in eastern Oregon. So these people from Portland are coming there to the area to hike, bike, hunt, fish in your local—and helping the local economy. Would they get equal input? What level of input would they have, since they are not from that immediate county region?

Mr. MCCLURE. Would they get input? Yes, they would get input, certainly. I mean if they are using public lands, we would listen to input from people outside the community. We have a relationship with the tribes. We deal with two tribes on a constant basis. We would take input. We understand that concept.

I do represent specifically the citizens of Union County. I do represent what their concerns are. But to suggest that we wouldn't listen to outside input, no, we would listen to outside input.

Mr. GRIJALVA. What I am asking, since they are not constituents in the sense of the word, what would be their level of input? Equal? And what role would they play in that process that the counties would be involved in, in terms of validating whatever plan comes out from Forest Service?

Mr. MCCLURE. Someone outside the county?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes.

Mr. MCCLURE. Like I said, we would consider their input, like we would consider any other input. OK? They would be invited to testify. I am not going to say that they would be the driving force, but we would not exclude input from anybody. We don't, in our processes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I think that covers—I think that kind of—yes, that answers it. Thank you.

Yield back, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Seeing no further questions, thank you very much for your testimony, and we will move on to panel two.

On our second panel we will hear from witnesses on two of my bills: H.R. 4029, it transfers land and facilities associated with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri; and H.R. 4182, that requires the Park Service to administer the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and it coordinates with its current management proposal.

Our first witness is Ms. Christy Roberts. Christy Roberts is from Ellington, Missouri. Our second witness will be Robert Ross. Robert is a State Representative from District 142 in the Missouri House of Representatives. And our third witness is Mr. Victor Knox. He is the Associate Director of Park Planning, Facilities and Lands with the National Park Service.

Witnesses all have 5 minutes to present their oral testimony. There are lights in front of you. When they turn from green to yellow you have one minute to finish. And when they turn red you must end your statement.

First let me thank the committee for taking their time to consider my two pieces of legislation, H.R. 4029 and H.R. 4182, re-

garding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, a national park contained wholly within the eight congressional district. If you all will recall, in this committee last July, I spoke with Secretary Sally Jewell about my opposition and my constituents' opposition to the National Park Service's planning process for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and specifically, any plan that would close horse trails, limit boat motors on the river, close access points to the river, or propose new congressional wilderness designations in the Park.

That November the Park Service released a draft general management plan that would do all four of these things, despite my public and frequent opposition to all four. In the meantime, I have sent numerous letters to or spoken up in this committee or in my office with everyone who will listen from the Park Service, including the witness today, Mr. Knox, asking that my concerns be taken into account.

Every indication that I have received leads me to think that a plan will be finalized for the Park this fall or late summer that closes horse trails, it limits boat motors on the river, closes access points, and advances the process of designating new congressional wilderness areas. If Mr. Knox knows otherwise, I would be interested in hearing differently today.

Having exhausted other remedies, I propose two different approaches to dealing with the management issues on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. H.R. 4029 would give the Park back to the State of Missouri, and H.R. 4182 would amend the statute that created the Park to ensure that the general management plan for the Park stays the same way as it is currently, while providing the additional protections for public use.

The State of Missouri has shown a willingness to receive the Park lands, including funds for the Park in this year's budget, and also sending two concurrent resolutions from each body of the legislature, asking Congress to consider turning the Park back over to the State of Missouri. State Representative Robert Ross led the charge in Missouri to secure funding for the Park, and he is here to testify today.

In addition to asking Congress to consider turning the Park back over to Missouri, these resolutions also supported a no-action alternative to the draft general management plan. This alternative would leave the Park as it is now, under a general management plan that has existed for over 30 years, and would not close horse trails or remove motorized vessels from areas of the Park where they are currently allowed, close public access points, or prepare new areas to be designated as congressional wilderness areas.

While there are certainly problems with the current management plan, it does not include these sweeping changes in the draft plan that threaten to undermine public access to the Park, threatening the entire area's tourism industry.

Ms. Christy Roberts is also here to testify today. And, as a lifelong resident of the area whose family has lived around and used the Park before it was Federal property, she can give you specific examples of how important the Park is to the region, how the local folks take care of it, and how the Park Service has abandoned its duties to the Park and to the region. It is my hope that, with this

hearing, we will highlight the importance of the lands that comprise the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in my district.

I look forward to the testimony of all the witnesses here today, and working together going forward to find an adequate solution to this problem.

Ms. Roberts.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTY ROBERTS, ELLINGTON, MISSOURI

Ms. ROBERTS. One half-century of management by neglect. That is the current legacy of the National Park Service in the Ozark Riverways, as seen by the locals. Fifty years of lost cultural and economic opportunity in a region ripe with both, and certainly in great need of the latter.

From the Park's almost immediate demolition of the lodge at Round Springs, which destroyed both an iconic landmark and a thriving business, to the more recently announced closing of the Big Spring Lodge and the cabins for a proposed 3 years.

Good morning. I am Christy Roberts, President of a local Chamber and a business owner in the region. I am honored to speak on behalf of the proposal to return these parks and riverways to the State of Missouri, and I am saddened by the necessity.

Much like the recent debacle in the VA, what is on paper and what is actually taking place are far from in agreement. The ONSR can produce records of federally supported river clean-ups, as the general management plan calls for, yet no one working in the canoe rentals or floating the river has seen such an effort for years. Organizations such as the Missouri Stream Teams and the Ozark Heritage Project are conducting the clean-ups, along with local boaters and conservation-minded tourists. National Park Service personnel are nowhere to be found.

If you review the 1984 general management plan, you will see impressive proposed projects and reasonable policy, much of which has not been implemented in the 30 years.

The ONSR will allow you to believe that the historical traditions of the local people are of great importance. However, their actions speak quite loud when they cancel local festivals created to highlight a way of life of the days gone by. This was prevalent when the Haunting of the Hills, a local favorite October event, and the Ozark Riverways Heritage Days were canceled in 2013. Thanks to a local organization, the Ozark Heritage Project, the above events will continue with very little assistance from the Park Service.

The ONSR promised to be a good steward of the Missouri lands granted them and, as Missourians, we doubt that promise and offer the following as proof.

Cemeteries, graveyards, and grave sites are now closed and inaccessible to the general public. They are overgrown, they are uncared for, and access is denied. Roads deemed illegal are closed or are proposed to be closed. This committee should be made aware that there are no illegal roads located in the ONSR. All roads, however remote, went somewhere at one point in history, of which may have been a church, a school, a cemetery, or a settler's homestead. It is necessary for locals and visitors to be allowed to experience these locations.

Historic structures were destroyed. They are allowed to deteriorate, those that are left, losing forever the historical value of the area and the former residents. River accesses are closed, and proposed closures are a major issue. River accesses are natural, and nearly all accesses are created by the natural occurrences of the rise and the fall of the river. Boat restrictions have been applied, with more restrictions yet to come.

It needs to be said that Secretary Udall, the first director of the ONSR, realized the necessity to have the word "recreation" included in the original legislation, and he intended for the main reasons—for the creation of the Park, all of them to have equal value: conservation, preservation, and recreation for all. The words "for all" do not limit the use of a boat to only canoes. The intention of the Park was for all to enjoy.

Primitive campsite closures and proposed closures. Primitive camping is a favorite pastime of visitors, and is a local and regional resident tradition. It is integral to the economy of the area that access is kept for the canoe outfitters, horse riders, and outboard motor visitors to enjoy in unity. The combined experiences of these groups should be enhanced and improved, not subject to yet further restrictions and limitations. My husband and his brothers are a fourth-generation family who still visit and utilize the river on a weekly basis. Their grandfather, Frank Roberts, and great-grandfather, John Richmond Roberts, both owned farms on the bank of the current river. They watched their family heritage torn apart, burned down, and destroyed at the hands of the very people that promised to preserve it. And I can express the grief that they still feel when they visit those areas.

This is only the story of our family. And I want to express that there are hundreds of families whose heritage was destroyed. And I am here today to speak for them. We have seen our rights deteriorate and stripped from us without reason, and we fear more is about to come. Our hope is that our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren will be afforded the same pleasures we enjoy, the same rights we have had, giving them the same opportunity for the next generation of families to experience.

We live here. And no one considers it more critical to be good stewards of the land than the residents who call this pristine location in the Ozarks home. I believe the State of Missouri would be a better steward of the lands located within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and have proven by the current outstanding Park System within the State that they are capable of this undertaking. I am proud to be here today in support of Representative Jason Smith's proposed bills to either transfer the Ozark National Scenic Riverways back to the State of Missouri, or to require the National Park Service personnel to administer the Park under the current 1984 general management plan.

I invite you to visit with us and get to know the people who truly can serve, preserve, and enjoy the recreation that our area provides. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Roberts follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHRISTY ROBERTS, ELLINGTON, MO
ON H.R. 4029 AND H.R. 4182

H.R. 4029

One half century of management by neglect. Fifty years of lost cultural and economic opportunity in a region ripe with both and certainly in great need of the latter. From the Park's almost immediate demolition of the Lodge at Round Springs which destroyed both an iconic landmark and a thriving business to the more recently announced closing of the Big Spring Lodge and Cabins for a proposed minimum of 3 years beginning at the end of this summer. These are just a few of the reasons why the residents in the region I live in applaud Representative Smith for the proposal of H.R. 4029.

I am Christy Roberts, President of the Ellington Chamber of Commerce and business owner in the region. I have witnessed firsthand much of this neglect in the past several decades—trash dumps created on the very sites that were once tourist attractions, access denied to family graveyards as well as gravel bars, timber allowed to rot and waste because of administrative inaction. My family and friends, many of which are business people and all of whom grew up for generations calling Current River home, have seen it all. I am honored to speak on behalf of the proposal to return these parks and riverway to the State of Missouri; and I am saddened by its necessity.

Much like the recent debacle in the VA, what they have on paper and what is actually taking place are far from in agreement. The ONSR can produce records of federally supported river clean-ups, as the present General Management Plan calls for—yet no one working at the canoe rentals or floating the river has seen such an effort for years. Organizations such as Missouri Stream Teams and the Ozark Heritage Project are conducting the clean-ups, along with the local boaters and conservation minded tourists. NPS personnel are nowhere to be found.

The ONSR will also allow you to believe that the historical traditions of the local people are of great importance; however their actions speak quite loud when they cancel local festivals created to highlight a way of life of days gone by. This was prevalent when the Haunting of the Hills, a local favorite October event and the Ozark Riverway Heritage Days were canceled in 2013. Both of these events highlighted important historical demonstrations such as Lye Soap Making, Rope Making, Quilting, Dutch Oven Cooking, Ozark Story Telling, I could go on. Thanks to a local organization, the Ozark Heritage Project, which in part was created just to re-establish these events and make sure the traditions of days gone by does not disappear, the above events will continue with very little assistance by the ONSR and without any funding.

The ONSR promised to be good stewards of the Missouri lands granted them and as Missourians we doubt that promise and offer the following proof:

1. Many cemeteries, graveyards and gravesites are now closed and inaccessible to the general public, they are overgrown, uncared for and access is denied.
2. Roads deemed "illegal" are closed or are proposed to be closed. This committee should be made aware that there are no "illegal" roads located in the ONSR, all roads, however remote went somewhere at one point in history, of which may have been a church, school, cemetery or settler's homestead. It is necessary for locals and visitors to be allowed to experience these locations.
3. Historic structures destroyed, allowed to deteriorate, losing forever the historic value to the area and former residents.
4. River access closed or proposed closures; river accesses are natural and nearly all accesses are created by the natural occurrences of the rise and fall of the river.
5. Boat restrictions applied; Secretary Udall, the first director of the ONSR realized the necessity to have the word "recreation" included in the original legislation and intended the main reasons for creation of the park to each have equal value; Conservation, preservation and recreation for all. The words "for all" do not limit use of a boat to only canoes, kayaks and rafts. The intention of the park was for all to enjoy. No one group should be singled out for exclusion.
6. Primitive camp site closures and proposed closures; primitive camping is a favorite past time of visitors and is a local and regional resident tradition. Campers at these sites are afforded no services for these camping locales even though they are required to pay a fee. Canoeists and guests who arrive by water are welcome to these same locations without having to pay a camp fee. I believe this to be an unjust discrimination to visitors who drive in while the NPS shows preference to preferred groups who float in.

7. Resistance to economic growth in the poorest counties in the State. It is integral to the economy of the area that access is kept for the canoe outfitters, horse riders and outboard motor visitors to enjoy in unity. The combined experiences of these groups should be enhanced and improved, not subjected to yet further restrictions and limitations.

My husband and his brothers are a 4th generation family who still visit and utilize the river on a weekly basis. Their grandfather Frank Roberts and great-grandfather John Richman Roberts both owned farms on the banks of the Current River. They watched their family heritage torn apart, burned down and destroyed at the hands of the very people that promised to preserve it and I can express the grief they still feel when we visit those areas. This is only the story of our family and I want to express there are hundreds of families who's heritage was destroyed and I am here today to speak for them as well. We have seen our rights deteriorate and stripped from us without reason and we fear more is about to come. Our hope is that our children, our grandchildren and our great grandchildren will be afforded the same pleasures we enjoy and the same rights we have had, giving the same opportunities to the next generation of the Roberts family. We live here and no one considers it more critical to be good stewards of the land than the residents who call this pristine location in the Ozarks home.

I believe the State of Missouri would be a better steward of the lands located within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway and have proven by the current outstanding park system within the State they we are capable of this undertaking.

I am proud to be here today in support of Representative Jason Smith's proposed bill to support the transfer of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway to the State of Missouri and I invite you to visit with us, get to know the people who truly intend to conserve, preserve and enjoy the recreation our area provides.

H.R. 4182

In lieu of the passage of H.R. 4029, H.R. 4182 would be very favorably received by the local communities and would allow the current economies to endure, visitors to remain constant, historical structures and locations to remain accessible and local resident traditions to carry on.

As noted in my testimony on H.R. 4029, the historical prevalence of the river and land is what locals believe has been typically forgotten since the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway.. Briefly allow me to highlight:

- Historical structures allowed to decline or be demolished
- Historical farm fields grown up and not remain as "pastoral settings"
- Historic roads, trails and river accesses closed
- Folk lore presentations discontinued
- Primitive camp sites closed
- Cemeteries not maintained

Then, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and the original authors who wrote the 1964 legislation to establish the park used the words conservation, preservation and recreation for all. The intention of the word preservation was to preserve the history of the original inhabitants and their activities, as well as preservation of the river and wildlife.

The addition of the wording "preservation of historical activities" to current policy and giving it the same weight in determining management decisions would improve the current policy.

H.R. 4182 requires the National Park Service personnel to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverway as it is currently being managed and to abide by the 1984 General Management Plan. The 1984 plan would continue to allow the horseback riders to continue the tradition of riding in the Ozarks, river accesses would remain open for all to enjoy, traditional recreation activities such as fishing, gigging, boating, canoeing, kayaking and swimming would all continue. River baptisms would be allowed to continue without restriction.

The inclusion that the National Park Service prohibit the addition of any land within the Ozark National Scenic Riverway boundary from being included in such initiatives as the recent "National Blueway" or past "Biosphere", and the requirement that National Park Service personnel not allowed to designate a "wilderness area" without the proper legislation from Congress is appreciated.

If the Ozark National Scenic Riverway and the National Park personnel would abide by the 1984 General Management Plan, implement and move forward with the proposed improvements to the park and allow for the current policy to remain

the rule, the Ozark National Scenic Riverway would continue to provide traditional river experiences to the visitors and local residents.

These rivers have truly been the lifeblood of the communities that grew up around them. These people developed a spirit along with a compassionate belief in assisting our neighbors and welcoming visitors. Personally and professionally Ozark people have attended to the needs of visitors for generations and this return to the original purpose of the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway would free local businesses and organizations to better do so again.

Lack of 1984 GMP Implementation

In the 1984 General Management Plan the NPS included commitments and policy to improvements to the park many of which have yet to be seen proving yet again the NPS is not a friend to the region but is directed by people who do not live in nor care about the communities that it is encompassed by.

1. The farms along the rivers had been allowed to grow up and become brush thickets. The 1984 plan promised to maintain many of the open fields in various stages of succession—for aesthetic benefit and to provide diversification favorable to wildlife; this was promised in the original plan as well, siting “pastoral settings” of the way the land was farmed before it became a park as an important visitor experience, however not until the lower river area was recently developed for the new elk being restored by the Missouri Dept of Conservation were the proposed fields manicured and revitalized. This was done at the expense of the Missouri tax payer.
2. The plan states that cultural resources will be vigilantly maintained and protected, however sites like the Lower Parker School, one of the last one-room school houses in Dent County is allowed to deteriorate. Cardareva School House is demolished and native rock removed, cemeteries are left in disarray, Button Rock School House continues to decline. I would also like to note that cultural experiences refers to camp locations, which often are located on an old family farm, visited by descendants and many of these have been closed off with large boulders prohibiting use. The NPS also attempted to halt river baptisms last year, a 200-year tradition in the Ozarks and I hardly believe that could be considered protecting the cultural resources of the area.
3. The plan encourages and supports efforts to stimulate study of regional folk life. We do not believe this has been done and is proven by the fact that park personnel were willing to allow several events that promote the introduction and exposure of local folk life to expire.
4. Litter was addressed in the plan and noted that existing cleanup program continues to include summer cleaning crews and an annual NPS/Canoe Concessioner cleanup day in March. To our knowledge this does not exist or is not publicized to allow for assistance by the locals. The only cleanup day events currently noted are done by the Missouri Stream Team and the Ozark Heritage Project, without the assistance of NPS personnel. As for summer cleaning crews, trash pickup was discontinued for many camping areas and providing trash bags was eliminated.
5. Campground to be built along with a 200-person amphitheater to be built at Aker’s was never built, nor the improvements at Powder Mill and the living demonstrations Blacksmithing, Horseshoeing and Sorghum Making have ceased; widening of the road to lower access at Log Yard and install concrete boat ramp, were never done. The plan also speaks of improvements at Jerk Tail and now that access is being threatened with closure and a 200-seat amphitheater to be constructed at Big Spring, also not completed.

These are all projects and improvements put forth in the 1984 GMP but have yet to be implemented. These need to be addressed as to why the commitments were not followed through on and the point needs to be made of their negative impact on the economies in the area and the level of accountability the leadership of the NPS has shown.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Ms. Roberts.
Representative Robert Ross.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. ROBERT ROSS, STATE REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT 142, MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Robert Ross, State Representative from the 142nd District in south-central Missouri. I am here today to talk about the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

But first, really, we should discuss the families, and from a number of perspectives. Number one, as Ms. Roberts mentioned, there are a number of families that, during the creation of this riverway, that either sold their land or had it taken from them in the process of eminent domain. And you have canoe rentals, you know. Those are ran by individuals that have families. The trail rides, the gas station owners, restaurants. I mean this is vital to our local economies.

And then there are also families like mine that use this breathtaking area to enjoy, to relax, to get away. Make no mistake, this is an area where memories are actually made, whether you are riding a horse for the first time, catching your first bass, seeing a bald eagle for the first time, which—all of these add to the passion of the issue.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a conglomerate of a number of things, of caves, springs, scenery, recreation, and wildlife centered around the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. When Congress saw the need to designate this as a national scenic riverway in 1964, there was a commitment and the intent to protect the area, while also protecting the individuals' access and ability, both near and far, to come and enjoy the natural beauty that we have there. Under the management of the National Park Service, this has been steadily and almost incrementally changing, and it is no longer the case at the present date.

The recent mode of operation includes harassing family campers whether their tent is 2 inches out of the correct position, or placing boulders and gates across the rivers and the access, along with this new proposed general management plan that they mention they prefer Alternative B, which—that alone would close two-thirds of the current horse trails which exist in the area.

It would make the upper 40 miles of both the Current and Jack's Fork non-motorized. You would not be allowed to camp on a gravel bar if it were not a designated camping area. And it would close 150 miles of roads which, despite their terminology as "illegal," those roads were there prior to that designation as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Those roads were made by the local individuals and part of the logging operations.

In this whole process of the comment period and, you know, relative to the general management plan, I heard it mentioned earlier in the hearing about eyewash. That is exactly what these hearings have been. They have not been held from a way of actually receiving public input and listening to what is being requested by the public.

At this point the National Park Service is failing their original commitment to balance the protection and preservation of the area and of individuals' access to the area, and now seems bent on keep-

ing people away. If the National Park Service is to continue managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, they should remember and re-read the language enacted in 1964, as previously mentioned, which balances the protection of the area with the protection of the people's ability to enjoy it, without proposing further restrictions and closing accesses, as contained within Congressman Smith's House Bill 4182.

This past year in Missouri, through a bipartisan effort on a House Concurrent Resolution Number 9, Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 22, we discussed being able to take this part back. In fact, as was mentioned earlier, I was able to add funding for that. In Missouri we understand the balance of protecting our land and allowing the people to enjoy it, which is evident in our State Park and Conservation System.

As Ms. Roberts previously mentioned, the people are the ones—the local people, not Park Service personnel, the local people are the ones that actually pick up the trash along the river and keep this area clean. Bringing the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers back under Missouri's management would be, by far and away, the best option to capture the original intent of the riverways creation, as outlined in Resolution 4029.

And at that point I would be happy to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Ross follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HON. ROBERT ROSS, STATE REPRESENTATIVE,
DISTRICT 142, MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H.R. 4029

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as we continue our discussion of Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and the best way to manage this treasure moving forward, I would like to advocate for what we Missourians believe to be the best option in balancing the preservation of the area and the recreational opportunities that it affords.

When Congress acted in 1964 to designate large portions of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers as a "Scenic Riverway," it did so with the intent and commitment of maintaining and protecting public access to an area that today receives more than 1.3 million visitors annually. In my conversations with some of the families who gave up their property (some land was purchased, while much was taken through Eminent Domain) those many years ago to allow for the creation of the ONSR, the recurring theme is that they did so because the Park Service assured them it would protect the riverways without limiting or restricting their access; and that future generations would be able to utilize and enjoy the area in the same manner that these local families had been able to. While that was the case for a number of years, the latest efforts by the National Park Service to restrict access and curtail recreational opportunity (which is a central theme in the proposed General Management Plan "GMP") threaten the integrity of the accord that was originally struck between the people of Missouri and the Federal Government.

As discussed in my previous testimony, our State has come together in supporting the "No Action Alternative" which would not further limit access or increase restrictions. And while we believe this would be the ideal plan for the National Park Service to utilize going forward, the most favorable option to ensure proper management of the park would involve the Federal Government relinquishing control of the ONSR and returning it to the State of Missouri. For that reason I am fully supportive of Congressman Smith's H.R. 4029 that would empower our State to manage and protect the ONSR as a State park.

These are Missouri lands and Missouri rivers, and I can confidently say that Missourians (as we have for generations) know best how to preserve and protect these resources both today and moving forward. We understand that this park is one of the greatest destinations in our Nation for floating, boating, hiking, camping, hunting, fishing and horseback riding, and we want to ensure visitors are able to enjoy these activities just as they have for decades. At the same time we are com-

mitted to protecting the ONSR as it represents a vital part of our local economies and an integral part of our way of life, and we are dedicated to ensuring it continues to be the natural treasure we all know it to be today.

As previously mentioned in my testimony on H.R. 4182, the resolutions passed in the Missouri House and Senate express that we believe “Missouri citizens most impacted in their daily lives are in the best position to formulate policy and regulations to manage and protect Missouri’s natural resources as opposed to a Federal agency headquartered in Washington, DC”. We emphasized that statement again this session when my colleagues supported my efforts to secure funding for the operation and maintenance of the ONSR by the State of Missouri, within our operating budget. It should be mentioned that our State constitution requires a balanced budget and that we have continued to walk a very fine line in finding funding for many of our most critical needs. To authorize funding for this purpose despite the difficult budget situation we face is a testimony itself to the high level of importance we place on Missouri regaining control of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

In conclusion, we urge you to take action to help us preserve access to this undeniably beautiful part of our State and Nation. It is possible to allow visitors to responsibly use and enjoy these waterways while also preserving and protecting their natural beauty so that they can be enjoyed by future generations as well. We believe it is not the National Park Service that is most capable of carrying out this mission, but instead our own State and people; which is evident in our conscientious management of the other thousands of acres we currently manage and protect. We hope that you will join us in supporting this effort to allow Missouri to serve as a responsible and proud steward of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Thank you for your consideration. I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

H.R. 4182

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to voice some of my thoughts and concerns regarding the management of Missouri’s Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

As the State representative for the 142nd legislative district, I represent approximately 37,000 Missourians, many of whom have their lives and livelihoods directly dependent on the continued success and accessibility of the natural treasures that are the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. It should go without saying that these waterways are an integral part of our culture and a vital part of our economy, and that the people I am blessed to serve feel very strongly about protecting and preserving this important part of our history and our future.

It is my contention that our scenic riverways must be protected but also managed in a way that will allow for proper stewardship that does not infringe on the rights of Missourians and visitors who wish to enjoy them. For decades now this has not been an issue as my constituents, as well as visitors from all around the State and the world, have camped, boated, hunted, fished and, in general, enjoyed the abundance of activities that are available along these waterways. It is this responsible use of the land that we want to continue.

However, given the latest actions of the National Park Service, it has become quite clear that the goal is to limit access to these natural treasures, which is a decision that will have catastrophic effects on the lives of my constituents, as well as on our local economies. In particular, we have grave concerns with the National Park Service’s preferred “Alternative B”. This particular plan will lead to increased restrictions on access and the outright elimination of recreational activities in vast portions along the riverways.

The people of Missouri are far more supportive of what is commonly referred to as the “No Action Alternative”. We believe this management plan will allow users to responsibly experience this area that we agree is special, which was the central idea shared by property owners, the State of Missouri, and the NPS when the ONSR was created. It is this option that we believe is consistent with the way the park has been successfully managed for decades, and that will give us the best opportunity moving forward to protect and preserve this natural treasure without disrupting the way of life for thousands of Missourians.

I feel it is important to note at this time that my colleagues in the Missouri General Assembly moved in overwhelming numbers this year to support this “No Action Alternative”. We approved both SCR 22 and HCR 9 in both the House and Senate this year. These resolutions not only encourage the adoption of the “No Action Alternative”, but also encourage Congress to explore the option of returning control of the park to the State of Missouri. As the resolutions read, we believe “Missouri citizens most impacted in their daily lives are in the best position to for-

mulate policy and regulations to manage and protect Missouri's natural resources as opposed to a Federal agency headquartered in Washington, DC."

Furthermore, H.R. 4182 goes beyond simply ensuring that the current general management plan does not become more restrictive, it provides specific protections for recreational activities that have historically been performed within the park, including riding horses and using boats with motors. It seems beyond reason, but the Park Service's proposed alternative for management would close 65 miles of horse trails that are currently in use, and ban motorized vessels from areas of the river where they are currently allowed.

In conclusion, we urge you to honor the original spirit of the agreement that was made when the Ozark National Scenic Riverways were first created. That means allowing Missourians to responsibly use and enjoy these waterways while also preserving and protecting their natural beauty so that they can be enjoyed by future generations as well. For decades we have been successful in this endeavor and we believe we can continue this success in the years to come without the need for overly burdensome regulations handed down by the National Park Service.

Thank you for your consideration. I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Representative.
Mr. Knox, please proceed.

**STATEMENT OF VICTOR KNOX, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK
PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERV-
ICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 4029 and H.R. 4182. I would like to submit our full statements on both of these bills for the record, and summarize the Department's views in my testimony.

H.R. 4029 would require the Secretary of the Interior to transfer all Federal land, facilities, and any other assets within Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri for the purpose of maintaining a State Park. The Department strongly opposes the enactment of H.R. 4029.

Our fundamental concern is that the bill would erode the idea of a Federal system of public lands, and the system of laws, regulations, and policy that govern the management of those lands. State governments have very different responsibilities for the management of State lands than the Federal Government, and are accountable only to residents within their particular States, rather than managing for the benefit of all Americans.

H.R. 4182 would require the Secretary of the Interior to administer Ozark National Scenic Riverways in accordance with the general management for that unit of the National Park System that was adopted in 1984. The Department strongly opposes the enactment of H.R. 4182.

This bill would undermine a public planning process that has been underway since 2005, and would deny the opportunity for all Americans, including Missourians, to have a voice in the future management of their national park.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I would be glad to answer any questions that you or members of the committee have. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Knox follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF VICTOR KNOX, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ON H.R. 4029, H.R. 4182, H.R. 318, H.R. 4489, H.R. 4049, AND H.R. 4527

H.R. 4029

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 4029, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to transfer all Federal land, facilities and any other assets associated with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri for the purpose of maintaining a State park, and for other purposes.

The Department strongly opposes the enactment of H.R. 4029.

H.R. 4029 would transfer all lands, facilities, and assets associated with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri to be operated as a State park in substantially the same fashion as it was operated as a unit of the National Park System. If the State of Missouri attempted to sell any portion of these lands, assets, or facilities, or did not operate them in the same fashion as the National Park Service, they would revert to the ownership of the Federal Government. The bill would also require the Federal Government to pay all of the costs of the transfer.

The Department has a number of concerns with H.R. 4029. Our fundamental concern is that the bill would erode the idea of a Federal system of public lands, and the system of laws, regulations, and policies that govern the management of those lands. The management of Federal lands involves the exercise of inherently Federal functions and decisionmaking by land managers for the long-term benefit of all Americans. State governments have very different responsibilities for the management of State lands than the Federal Government, and are accountable only to residents within their particular States. Accordingly, each State would be under strong pressure to manage according to local rather than national interests.

2014 marks the 50th anniversary of the designation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a unit of the National Park Service. In 1964, Missouri's Congressional delegation united in support of a bill to set aside 134 miles of crystal clear spring-fed rivers in recognition of the inherent value of the unique scenic, natural and historic values of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers in the Ozark Highlands as a crucial part of our national heritage. Public Law 88-492 was the culmination of 40 years of efforts by local businessmen, State officials and conservationists and became the model for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, a landmark conservation act, signed into law by President Nixon.

The enabling legislation charged the National Park Service with conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, preserving portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, caring for a world class spring system unparalleled in North America, including the largest spring protected in the national park system, and over 400 caves situated in the valleys and narrow hollows that meander between steep ridges, and for providing for the use and enjoyment of these outstanding outdoor recreation resource for the people of the United States.

This mandate to conserve the park's resources while providing for access and recreational opportunities mirrors the mandate contained in the National Park Service Organic Act. The Riverways' 80,785 acres protect an important center of biodiversity, including three listed threatened and endangered species and numerous endemic species not found elsewhere in the world. The Riverways also contain many archeological sites and historic structures and landscapes that reflect more than 12,000 years of human habitation in the Ozark Highlands. Interpretation and education programs focus on the rich cultural heritage of the region. Tourism and recreation opportunities, such as boating, fishing, and horseback riding, are encouraged by the park and managed in balance with these resources and the diverse interests and desires of multiple user groups from across the Nation.

In 2012, Ozarks National Scenic Riverways welcomed 1.4 million visitors and generated approximately \$56 million in economic benefits for the surrounding community. Enactment of H.R. 4029 would not only contravene the intent of the Missouri delegation when it initially established the Riverways as a unit of the National Park System, it would also diminish the stature of these nationally significant resources and could reduce the economic benefits that accrue to national park sites by alienating certain user groups.

The park is currently engaged in a planning process to update its 1984 General Management Plan. This public process ensures that all Americans, including all Missourians, have a voice in the management of their park. Over 2,800 people from across the Nation have provided more than 16,000 comments and participated in

public meetings, open houses, and stakeholder workshops since the planning process began in 2005. Ozark National Scenic Riverways has published a draft General Management Plan and collected public comments on this draft. The National Park Service is currently considering changes to the plan based on public comments, and anticipates releasing the final plan by early 2015.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony on H.R. 4029. I am prepared to answer any questions from members of the committee.

H.R. 4182

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 4182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to administer the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in accordance with the General Management Plan for that unit of the National Park System and for other purposes.

The Department strongly opposes the enactment of H.R. 4182.

H.R. 4182 would amend the purpose of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to include the preservation of historical recreational activities. The bill would prohibit the park from designating management zones and would require the National Park Service to manage the park, including the use of motorized vessels within the park, in a manner that is not more restrictive than the policies detailed in the park's 1984 General Management Plan. The bill would also require the park to allow horseback riding in areas where that activity has traditionally been conducted and to maximize public access points for traditional recreational activities on the Riverways. It would prohibit the park from requiring a permit for a baptism in the river, or including the Riverways as part of a National Blueway, or managing park lands as wilderness without specific designation. The bill would exclude all lands within the park from eligibility for Congressional wilderness designation.

H.R. 4182 would undermine a public planning process that has been underway since 2005, and deny the opportunity for all Americans, including Missourians, to have a voice in the future management of their national park. The park is concluding the planning process to update its 1984 General Management Plan. Over 2,800 people from across the Nation have provided more than 16,000 comments and participated in public meetings, open houses, and stakeholder workshops since the planning process began in 2005. Ozark National Scenic Riverways has published a draft General Management Plan and collected public comments on this draft. The National Park Service is currently considering changes to the plan based on public comments, and anticipates releasing the final plan by early 2015. Enactment of H.R. 4182 would force the park to disregard the input that it has received from park users.

Public participation is at the core of the National Park Service planning process—it ensures that the NPS fully understands and considers the public's interest in the parks. It is NPS policy to actively seek out and consult with existing and potential visitors, neighbors, federally recognized tribes, and other people with traditional cultural ties to park lands, scientists and scholars, concessioners, cooperating associations, and gateway communities. The Department cannot support any bill that would deny the public's opportunity to engage in the planning process and voice their opinions on the future management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

H.R. 4182 includes a number of provisions related to the administration of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways.

- **Zones:** Management zoning is a standard practice of local and regional planning as well as planning for national parks. Management zones provide direction to managers on the nature and scope of allowable activities within specific areas. Management zones are written broadly enough to allow the flexibility to adapt management strategies according to current and desired conditions.
- **Horseback Riding:** Horseback riding is currently allowed in the park and the NPS is looking to sustain the activity in such a way as to not harm resources, specifically the exceptional waters of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.
- **Access to the River:** The National Park Service is committed to providing access to the rivers in a responsible manner. Baptisms do not require a permit. We have reviewed our management policies and determined that the superintendent has the flexibility to continue to allow baptisms without a special use permit. Also, the Secretary of the Interior issued an order ending the Blueways program last year.
- **Use of Motorized Vessels:** The National Park Service is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of motorized vessel use within the Riverways as part of the ongoing planning process. H.R. 4182 would deny the public the oppor-

tunity to share their views on appropriate horsepower levels and areas of use and would limit the park manager's ability to make necessary modifications for public safety which could negatively affect tourism.

- Congressional Wilderness Designation: The Wilderness Act directs Federal agencies to assess if wilderness characteristics are present and then provides a process for public involvement. This issue is being considered in the ongoing General Management Planning process and we cannot support limiting the public's input during this process. We recognize that only Congress has the authority to designate wilderness.

Additionally, H.R. 4182 effectively eliminates the National Park Service Organic Act as the fundamental law by which the Riverways would be administered. This law is the basis by which all of the other 400 units of the National Park System are managed and eliminating its applicability to the Riverways is a precedent we strongly oppose.

The Ozarks National Scenic Riverways is a powerful economic driver in southeast Missouri. In 2012, Ozarks National Scenic Riverways welcomed 1.4 million visitors and generated approximately \$56 million in economic benefits for the surrounding community. The National Park Service encourages tourism and recreation opportunities, such as canoeing, kayaking, floating, horseback riding, camping, boating, fishing, trapping, hiking, gigging, swimming, and hunting. By supporting these activities, while conserving the unique natural and cultural resources that inspired Congress to protect these lands as part of the national park system, and with the input of diverse user groups from across the Nation, the National Park Service is helping to ensure that the park is responsive to users across America and remains an economic driver for future generations of Missourians and others.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony on H.R. 4182. I am prepared to answer any questions from members of the committee.

H.R. 318

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 318, to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance.

The Department opposes H.R. 318 because it would significantly alter the character of the existing Korean War Veterans Memorial, and it is inconsistent with the Commemorative Works Act.

H.R. 318 would amend Public Law 99-572 to expand upon the original purpose and design of the Korean War Veterans Memorial. The bill adds new subjects for commemoration and would require the display of certain information at the memorial about members of the U.S. Armed Forces who served in the Korean Conflict. Also, the bill would require the display of information at the memorial about members of the Korean armed forces and other Korean military personnel as well as the 20 other non-U.S. forces that were part of the United Nations Command who served in the Korean Conflict.

The Korean War Veterans Memorial commemorates the sacrifices of the 5.8 million Americans who served in the U.S. armed services during the 3-year period of the Korean War. The Memorial also recognizes the participation of the 22 nations who served as United Nations contributors. During the Korean War's relatively short duration from June 25, 1950, to July 27, 1953, 54,246 Americans died. Of these, 8,200 are listed as missing in action, lost, or buried at sea. In addition, 103,284 were wounded during the conflict.

The Memorial was designed, constructed and completed by its legislatively designated sponsor, the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC) and the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board, with public involvement throughout. It was dedicated on July 27, 1995.

The Memorial's design, and each of its features down to its plantings, is symbolic. The Memorial is the culmination of years of work by the ABMC, and careful reviews, followed by revisions, and ultimately approvals reached by the National Park Service and other Federal entities including the National Capital Planning Commission and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. This painstaking and public process began with the competition design, and resulted in the completed Memorial we know today. The Memorial should not now be changed to include the engraving of names of Americans who served in that conflict. The opportunity to mimic the design characteristics present at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was purposefully avoided when the design was requested during an open, international design competition.

The concept of engraving names at this Memorial was considered extensively when the Memorial was being designed. The ABMC and the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board with the Department's concurrence, advised against the incorporation of engraved names at the Memorial. Both agencies arrived at this decision upon reflection of years of experience with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Inscribing names is a lengthy and painstaking process even when it goes smoothly. But more important, as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial experience showed, there is not always agreement on those names to be included and those names that are not, and this has led to public contention and controversy. Choosing some names and omitting others causes a place of solace to become a source of hurt. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial honors all who served in that conflict, but only the names of the 58,272 killed within the combat zone are engraved on the Wall. This meant that those killed by a fire on a Navy ship just outside the zone were not eligible to have their names engraved on the wall—a difficult message for their survivors to accept.

The ABMC and the Department felt the lessons learned at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial must not be ignored, that a different type of commemoration must occur at the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and that the Memorial should be representative in design and not include individual names. As a compromise to the Korean War veterans who wanted the names engraved, ABMC created the Korean War Honor Roll, which is an electronic registry of names. Visitors have access to this registry from the Internet or at the kiosks at the Memorial. A kiosk containing the Korean War Honor Roll stands at the west entrance of the Memorial. It is serviced by a National Park Service ranger, who provides assistance to visitors. The Honor Roll computer contains the names of all military personnel who lost their lives during the Korean War, including the individual's name, service, rank, service number, date of birth, hometown or county of entry into the service, cause of death, and date of death. If the information is furnished to ABMC, the Honor Roll includes the serviceman's unit, his awards, the circumstances surrounding his death or his going missing in action and a photograph. The ABMC also has the names of those missing engraved at the Courts of the Missing at the Honolulu Memorial.

The Korean War Veterans Memorial is located near the Lincoln Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, DC, in an area designated by Congress in the Commemorative Works Act as the Reserve—an area in which no new commemorative works shall be located. As Congress noted in the law creating the Reserve, “. . . the great cross-axis of the Mall in the District of Columbia . . . is a substantially completed work of civic art; and . . . to preserve the integrity of the Mall, a reserve area should be designated . . . where the siting of new commemorative works is prohibited.” The Korean War Veterans Memorial is a completed work of civic art in this special landscape of the Reserve. Moreover, we cannot ignore the practical effect of this legislation. Essentially, the Memorial wall would be a second Korean War Veterans Memorial, effectively thwarting the intent of the Commemorative Works Act to prohibit new memorials within the Reserve and would be an addition that would significantly alter the character of the existing Memorial. And this second memorial would have the effect of violating the Commemorative Works Act prohibition on interfering or encroaching on an existing memorial.

We feel very strongly that the Korean War Veterans Memorial, like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, exists to recall the exemplary service and sacrifice of outstanding Americans, and this memorial has already been completed as it stands today. The Korean War Veterans Memorial is a place of honor and dignity and we should avoid any intrusions that will become a source of contention or controversy.

That concludes my prepared testimony on H.R. 318, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

H.R. 4489

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 4489, a bill to designate memorials to the service of members of the U.S. Armed Forces in World War I, and for other purposes.

The Department supports H.R. 4489 with two amendments.

H.R. 4489 would redesignate Pershing Park in the District of Columbia as the National World War I Memorial and allow for the enhancement of the park through the construction of appropriate sculptural and other commemorative elements, including landscaping, to further honor the service of members of the U.S. Armed Forces in World War I. The bill also designates the Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as the

National World War I Museum and Memorial. Finally, the bill makes amendments to the World War I Centennial Commission Act.

The Department has testified previously on other bills which sought to designate a National World War I Memorial in either the District of Columbia or at the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri. In the 111th Congress, S. 760 and H.R. 1849 proposed designating the Liberty Memorial as the National World War I Memorial, while S. 2097 would have rededicated the District of Columbia War Memorial as a National and District of Columbia World War I Memorial. In the 112th Congress, H.R. 938 proposed to designate the Liberty Memorial as the National World War I Museum and Memorial, and the District of Columbia War Memorial as the District of Columbia and National World War I Memorial. In each case, the Department testified that it was premature to establish a National World War I Memorial without studying existing sites that may already serve that role. The Department also testified that a national memorial to World War I already exists in the District of Columbia.

General John J. Pershing Park, located in the along Pennsylvania Avenue between 14th and 15th Streets NW, was built by the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and is now under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. The park includes a statue of General Pershing and artwork detailing the major battles in World War I that involved U.S. troops. Quotations on the existing World War I Veterans Memorial at Pershing Park include General Pershing's tribute to the officers and men of the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I and a commemoration of those who served in the United States Navy in World War I. The Department believes that this is the appropriate site to commemorate World War I.

The National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC) has concluded that the existing World War I Memorial at Pershing Park serves today as a national memorial to the veterans who served in World War I. On July 23, 2013, NCMAC considered H.R. 222, which would have established a new and separate memorial to the veterans of World War I within the District of Columbia. The Commission unanimously recommended enhancing the existing World War I Memorial in Pershing Park rather than establishing a second memorial. More recently, on May 6, 2014, NCMAC considered H.R. 4489 and its companion bill, S. 2264. The intent of the bill to enhance the existing commemoration at Pershing Park was met with unanimous approval.

H.R. 4489 directs that there will be no infringement upon the existing District of Columbia War Memorial, and provides for compliance with the Commemorative Works Act (CWA), with two exceptions. The bill waives section 8905 with regard to site selection, as Pershing Park is an existing memorial site and the bill only calls for its re-designation. The bill, also, waives section 8908(b) of the CWA, as the Area I designation process is precluded by re-designation of Pershing Park. The Department agrees with these waivers. It further prohibits Federal funds from being used for the design, establishment, or enhancement of a memorial or commemorative work by the WWI Centennial Commission.

Because of the importance of World War I to the history of the United States and consistent with the treatment of memorials to other significant wars fought by our country, the Department believes that this bill would designate the National World War I Memorial as a new unit of the National Park Service, which would in turn be managed by the National Mall and Memorial Parks. We recommend that language be included in the text of the legislation establishing the memorial as a separate unit of the National Park System.

The Department also recommends striking "national" from the name of the title of the memorial to redesignate Pershing Park in the District of Columbia as the World War I Memorial. No other memorials to our country's wars sited in the District of Columbia have "national" in their title, including the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. We believe siting the World War I Memorial in our Nation's capital will allow the memorial to stand on its own and provide appropriate recognition to honor the service and sacrifice of all those who fought in this war.

The proposed amendments are attached. In addition, the Department of Justice advises that it has constitutional concerns with H.R. 4489, which it intends to convey to the committee by separate transmission.

This concludes my testimony on H.R. 4489, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Proposed Amendment to H.R. 4489

On page 2, strike lines 17–19 and insert:

“(a) REDESIGNATION.—Pershing Park in the District of Columbia is hereby redesignated as the ‘World War I Memorial’, a separate unit of the National Park System.”

H.R. 4049

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 4049, a bill to amend the act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes.

The Department supports the enactment of H.R. 4049 with the amendments discussed below.

H.R. 4049 would adjust the boundary of the Apostle Island National Lakeshore (Lakeshore) to include the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, thereby transferring ownership of the historic 1915 lighthouse to the National Park Service (NPS) from the U.S. Coast Guard in accordance with previously enacted legislation which mandates that any Federal property located within the boundaries of the Lakeshore be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior without further administrative action. H.R. 4049 ensures that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers can maintain the breakwater upon which the lighthouse stands, and, in accordance with the terms of the previously enacted legislation, the U.S. Coast Guard can continue to maintain a Federal aid to navigation in the lighthouse. All three agencies would be required to cooperate in their operations so that each of their agency missions is served.

Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, located on the south shore of Lake Superior, is responsible for the care of what renowned lighthouse historian F. Ross Holland, Jr., has described as “the largest and finest single collection of lighthouses in the country.” The park manages six historic light stations, and a total of eight standing light towers—more than in any other unit in the National Park System. All of the lighthouses currently located within the boundary of the Lakeshore, as well as the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Lakeshore has developed into one of the premier locations in the National Park System for historic preservation and education centered on lighthouses, including interpretive programs highlighting the stories of light keepers and the expansion of the United States in the late 19th century through maritime commerce. In 2006, Apostle Islands rehabilitated the 1863 Raspberry Island Lighthouse, which is a very popular visitor attraction. This year, the Lakeshore is concluding a major historic preservation project that will rehabilitate the 1856 Old Michigan Island Light, the oldest in the park, and significantly improve conditions at four other light stations.

All of the lighthouses currently managed by Apostle Islands National Lakeshore were transferred from the U.S. Coast Guard to the National Park Service as part of a Congressionally authorized boundary adjustment and land transfer in 1986 that mandated that any Federal property located within the boundaries of the Lakeshore be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. At the time of the 1986 transfer, the future of the Ashland Light was not in question.

In May 2012, the Coast Guard announced its intent to dispose of the Ashland Light under the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act (NHLPA). The NHLPA, enacted in 2000 as an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act, provides a public process for the disposal of federally owned historic light stations by allowing them to be transferred at no cost to Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofit corporations, educational agencies, and community development organizations. The first step is the determination of the property as “excess to service requirements” by the U.S. Coast Guard and its identification as a historic structure. This determination is reported to the General Services Administration and notice is given that applications may be made for the structure. If an application is accepted, the lighthouse is simply transferred to the applicant subject to compliance with requirements to maintain the light and make it available to the public.

No public or private entity, aside from the NPS, expressed interest in obtaining and maintaining the Ashland Light through the NHLPA process. However, as the Ashland Light is not within the existing park boundary, a boundary adjustment is needed to clarify that the property will be administered as part of the park.

The Ashland Light sits in Lake Superior’s Chequamegon Bay, less than 2 miles offshore of the small city of Ashland, Wisconsin. The tower is visible from most of the city’s waterfront, and the light shines brightly at night. Images of the Ashland

Light are everywhere in the city; they adorn the logos of the local newspaper, the Chamber of Commerce, and many local businesses. Few residents, however, have actually visited the Ashland Light or understand the vital role it played in one of the busiest ports on Lake Superior a century ago.

The Ashland Light is currently in fair condition, but its long-term survival as part of the Nation's maritime heritage is not assured. The NPS and the local community are optimistic that the condition could be improved and appropriate visitor educational opportunities could be provided in the future if the Ashland Light were managed as part of Apostle Island National Lakeshore. With the addition of the Ashland Light, the NPS would manage all of the nationally significant historic lights in the region, further enhancing the park's role in historic lighthouse preservation and education.

The Department would recommend three amendments:

The Department recommends deleting the portion of the amendment made in Section 2 that provides buffer zone language. The park boundary adjustment in H.R. 4049 includes only the lighthouse itself, not any of the waters of the Bay. The NPS has no authority to manage or permit activities outside of park boundaries. Fishing, boating, snowmobiling, and all other existing uses of the Bay's waters are not affected by this bill. The buffer zone language is unnecessary.

The Department recommends that the portion of Section 2 of the bill directing the Federal agencies to cooperate in their operations be amended to clarify congressional intent. The bill does not otherwise alter the statutory standards or other mandates of the three agencies, nor does it affect the ongoing need for them to work cooperatively to carry out those mandates in the area, as they currently do with respect to other lighthouses within the boundary. We would be glad to work with the subcommittee to amend the existing language to ensure that the bill does not affect the missions of these agencies.

Finally, the Department recommends deleting Section 3, which directs that no additional appropriations are to be authorized for the Lakeshore as a result of this boundary adjustment. The enabling legislation of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore makes no reference to the authorization of appropriations. In the absence of such authorizing language, adding language that specifically restricts the increase of appropriations for this particular boundary adjustment could be construed as prohibiting any future increase in appropriations for the park even if that increase was unrelated to the addition of the Ashland Light.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony on H.R. 4049. I am prepared to answer any questions from members of the committee.

H.R. 4527

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 4527, a bill that would remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the Town of Tremont, Maine.

The Department could support H.R. 4527 if amended.

H.R. 4527 declares that specified lands in Acadia National Park in Maine, which were conveyed by the National Park Service to the town of Tremont, Maine, for school purposes, shall no longer be required to be used exclusively and perpetually for such purposes, and upon their discontinuance of such a use, shall no longer be required to revert to the United States.

The town of Tremont has contacted Acadia National Park concerning land currently used for the town's school. This parcel of land was owned by the National Park Service (NPS) and is known as NPS Tract 06-126. In 1950, Public Law 81-629 permitted the NPS to convey the land to the town to locate the new school. The conveyance was completed in 1951, with a reverter clause included in the deed specifying that the land would revert back to the United States of America if no longer used exclusively for school purposes.

The town is now consolidating schools with a neighboring town and thus this property will no longer be used exclusively for school purposes. The town of Tremont would like to retain ownership and continue to use the developed property for community purposes. This legislation would allow it to do so.

Acadia National Park has no intended uses for the property, and the NPS is agreeable to allowing the town to use the property for broader public purposes, so long as the use of the property will not degrade or adversely impact park resources and values. However, H.R. 4527 would eliminate entirely the requirement that the property revert to the Federal Government if it is not used for school purposes. Because the original 1951 conveyance was made without consideration, the bill as

introduced would effectively convey Federal property to the town free of cost and with no requirement that it be used for a specific purpose.

For this reason, the Department could support this bill only if it is amended to require that the property revert to the Federal Government if does not remain in public ownership for recreational, educational or similar public purposes, or if it degrades or adversely impacts park resources and values as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. The Department recommends an amendment to H.R. 4527 for this purpose and we would be glad to work with the committee on appropriate language.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony on H.R. 4527. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or other members of the subcommittee may have regarding the proposed action.

Mr. SMITH. Any questions from Members? Mr. Grijalva?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you. Mr. Knox, the controversy around the draft general management plan stems from the perception that the Park Service is trying to limit or alter access for motorized watercraft. Is that the case?

Mr. KNOX. The general management plan looks at a range of alternatives that would change access by motorized watercraft. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GRIJALVA. And one of the other questions that I had had to do with—are the changes made between the publishing of the draft plan and the publication of the final plan?

Mr. KNOX. Yes. We are estimating that a final plan will be issued some time in early 2015. And because of the significant comment by Congressman Smith and local citizens and many others on this plan, we are taking some time to think through, listening carefully to those comments, continue to engage with stakeholders and make the hard decisions about what is the right balance between access and enjoyment and preservation of the wonderful place that is Ozark Scenic National Riverways.

So, there will be—we anticipate changes between the preferred alternative and the final plan.

Mr. GRIJALVA. If I may, Mr. Chairman, just, if there is no objection, enter into the record communication from the Conservation Federation of Missouri in opposition to both pieces of legislation; another communication from Friends of the Ozark Riverway, 24 organizations, the same, in opposition to the legislations before us, both of them. With that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Without objection. Thank you.

Further questions?

[No response.]

Mr. SMITH. I have questions. First off, Mr. Ross, did you attend the different—I mean Ms. Roberts. Did you attend the comment period during the general management plan hearings?

Ms. ROBERTS. Yes, I attended both during different times. We have actually had two different comment periods. And I attended several meetings on the first comment period and submitted comments, attended three of the four meetings on the second comment period, and sent in my comments according to what was told to me by the National Park Service to do.

In the first comment period, we were allowed to choose no comment—or no action. And that was one of the plans. There were four plans that were presented to the public. And there were well over

5,000, possibly 6,000 comments that went in to the National Park Service requesting no action be taken. That was a comment period that happened a couple of years ago.

Then, this past December and January, early February, during the second comment period, whenever the public attended the meetings, people were told—even though the no action was listed as an option, people were told, “Don’t choose no action. We are not going to listen to you.” And this was told to us by Park Service personnel.

Mr. SMITH. And, with that statement, since you attended these meetings, and no action wasn’t even an option, what was the sentiment of the folks that were at these hearings? I mean do they want the general management to stay the same that it has for the last 30 years, or did they want any of those other alternatives?

Ms. ROBERTS. Most of the people that were in attendance at the meetings would prefer that everything stay the way it is now.

Mr. SMITH. So you would say the majority.

Ms. ROBERTS. The majority.

Mr. SMITH. OK.

Ms. ROBERTS. Absolutely the majority.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Ms. ROBERTS. And I believe those comment cards from the first comment period prove overwhelmingly that that is what the people want.

Now, I do want to make note that at these meetings people of the Ozarks are simple people. We are very simple. And you have elderly people, some people that lived on those rivers 50 years ago when it was taken from them, that showed up. And they were told, right off the bat, “Don’t even bother putting down no action. Take Plan B, which is the least of the three other alternatives. Take that, and pick it apart. Take the policy in there that you don’t like.” Well, have you read that? It is a lot of pages. The people in the area just know what they want, and they want everything to stay the same that it was.

Mr. SMITH. OK. Representative Ross, you attended a lot of these hearings, as well.

Mr. ROSS. I did.

Mr. SMITH. Do you believe that we need statutory protections for public access in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, or has the Park Service done a good job using its discretion to promote the balance of preservation, preserving our resources and allowing recreational activity?

Mr. ROSS. Well, I think, clearly, that is one of the things that is needed in this case. I mean in recent years the Park Service has clearly shown the direction they are heading, and that is to curtail access, whether that is to place boulders across the road, put up gates, say that you can’t use a boat within—a motorized boat within this certain section of the river. As I mention in my testimony, closing off two-thirds of the horse trails that are in the area.

And, this affects a number of businesses, regardless of whether they are directly in that area or not. There are a number of people that come through that buy gas, that eat at the restaurants, that use other services. And without some sort of a protection, this is going to be absolutely detrimental to our economy.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Mr. Knox, in your written testimony you raise concerns about changing the management of the ONSR as it relates to the NPS Organic Act. Can you tell me what year did the Organic Act pass?

Mr. KNOX. 1916.

Mr. SMITH. 1916? Well, Mr. Knox, if there is value in continuing to manage the ONSR under the Organic Act from 1916, isn't there also value in keeping the current general management plan since 1984, which has worked for over 30 years?

Mr. KNOX. The National Park Service Organic Act that was passed in 1916—and we will be celebrating the centennial of the National Park System in 2 years—is—

Mr. SMITH. And that has worked for 98 years.

Mr. KNOX. It has worked well for 98 years. It applies to all 401 units of the National Park System, and it is really what unifies us as a National Park System, the parks and recreation areas within the system.

Mr. SMITH. All right. Looks like time has expired. Let's do another round of questions. Are there other Members that would like to ask some questions?

[No response.]

Mr. SMITH. OK. Well, then, I am going to ask some questions. Thank you.

Mr. Knox, what is the Park Service doing with the comments that were created earlier in 2008 under the general management provisions?

Mr. KNOX. I believe you are talking about the comments on the alternatives document that came out originally?

Mr. SMITH. During what Ms. Roberts spoke of, of the comments that were taken in the late 2000s, there were thousands of comments in regards to the no-action plan. What are you all doing with those comments?

Mr. KNOX. Those—if I understand the question, those comments were used to develop the draft GMP. So we issued an alternatives document to look at, you know, potential alternatives for the draft GMP, solicited comments on that. Those were used to design the range of alternatives in the general management plan.

Mr. SMITH. And were those comments ever public?

Mr. KNOX. As far as I know, there are public comments, yes.

Mr. SMITH. And, from my understanding, those comments showed overwhelmingly for a no-action alternative. But in all of the alternatives that you listed in the current general management plan, no action was not even an option. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOX. No. No action is one of the alternatives in the current draft general management plan. It is required to be analyzed under NEPA.

Mr. SMITH. From my understanding, option A, B, and C. But from the hearing, you didn't—couldn't even really do no action, the public comments. So it is your understanding that no action was one of the issues that people could have as an alternative during the current general management plan comment period?

Mr. KNOX. It is one of the alternatives being considered in the draft general management plan, yes.

Mr. SMITH. All right. Ms. Roberts, is that your impression from that?

Ms. ROBERTS. Absolutely not. We were told at the meetings that we could not choose—if we chose to put no action, that our comments would be thrown out.

Mr. SMITH. Representative Ross, is that your response? Is that your understanding?

Mr. ROSS. In looking back through this whole process—and this has been an ongoing process since 2003, 2004. And I am not sure if those comments are still available. At one time they were. And the statement that the current draft general management plan, the different alternatives that are now listed, are a derivative of the original comments, I find hilarious. Because I read through those original comments, a lot of those comments, and in no way—you know, it was a very small minority, would reflect anything close to what is now contained within the draft plan alternative A, B, or C. The overwhelming majority of those early comments substantively said no—no-action alternative.

Mr. SMITH. So, Representative Ross, in the current general management plan draft that has just went through public comment, was there a no-action option? There was plan A, plan B, plan C, but was there a no-action alternative?

Mr. ROSS. Well, I think there was an option, but then you have the Park Service itself coming out and saying that this is—alternative B is what they prefer, this is basically what they are going to choose, regardless of the input that they receive. What sort of a message is that sending to the public, when “You don’t have the choice to choose this alternative, because we are not going to hear your concerns”?

Mr. SMITH. From the concurrent resolutions that you all passed out of the State House and State Senate, in the resolution it said that in 1959 the State of Missouri encouraged Congress to pass the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which they did——

Mr. ROSS. Right.

Mr. SMITH [continuing]. In 1964. It said that the reason for doing so, and why the State would relinquish their State parks, is because they wanted to make sure that there was a true preservation of the natural resources and allowing the abundant recreational resource for generations to come. Is that true?

Mr. ROSS. Yes. Yes, it is. And, one of the things that I strongly disagree with Mr. Knox in his testimony in talking about the lack of management of our State parks or our conservation land for all Americans, rather than just a strict focus on managing those lands for Missourians, contradictory to his testimony, the restrictions that the Park Service is attempting to implement here are the restrictions that would keep away more individuals from being able to come and enjoy and access the treasures that we have.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Representative Ross. Further questions?

Mr. GRIJALVA. If I may, Mr. Chairman, just a clarification.

Mr. SMITH. Proceed.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, just a clarification.

Ms. Roberts?

Ms. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRIJALVA. You said that the no option was the preferred by 5,000—the vast majority of the people that attended these hearings.

Ms. ROBERTS. Correct.

Mr. GRIJALVA. You also said that the Forest Service, during those, was saying to don't count those, they are not going to count because we want preferred option B.

Ms. ROBERTS. Correct. Let me—

Mr. GRIJALVA. So—

Ms. ROBERTS. Let me clarify.

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK.

Ms. ROBERTS. There were two comment periods. During the first comment period, everybody did basically as they were—as they felt. Many people sent in comment cards, and we had postcards made up so that it was easy for the local people to send in what plan they preferred. And there were well over 5,000—could have been 6,000—no-action comments. And we know of those.

During the second comment period, whenever you attended the meetings, there were Park rangers set up at each station. And at each station there were different alternatives. There was a person, a Park Service personnel sitting there with a computer. So if you didn't have a way to be able to send in your comments, you could sit down with a Park personnel, and they would fill out that comment for you. However, everyone was encouraged not to choose no action. And we were told by the Park Service personnel to take plan B, because that was the least invasive, and to tear it apart.

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK.

Ms. ROBERTS. To take the policy and to put in how we would like to see it. And, in my opinion, that is a lot to ask of the people. It was very simple for the people to say that they wanted no action. And they were told during the second round that no action was not an option.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much for the clarification.

Mr. KNOX, on that same point, personnel from the Forest Service, Park Service, indicating to people that they had to take an option from the range of choices that they had, any reaction to the point that Ms. Roberts just made?

Mr. KNOX. I am not aware of what was said at those public meetings by Park Service personnel, and so whether that is accurate, that people were told not to choose a no option or a no-action alternative. So I really can't comment on that specifically.

What I can tell you is that we do have a no-action alternative that is being evaluated within the draft general management plan, and there is a preferred alternative. And the reason to have a preferred alternative is to let everyone know that comes to the meetings and that cares about the plan—

Mr. GRIJALVA. No, I understand that part. I understand that part.

Mr. KNOX. No, but what we are thinking about, so they can comment on—

Mr. GRIJALVA. But the no-action indication by the public that is—because I have experienced that in public lands in my district, as well—is an indicator that the preferred option, to say the least,

needs some work. And so I appreciate the clarification and your response, and I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Mr. Knox, is it appropriate for the Park Service to advocate that you should not use a no-action alternative?

Mr. KNOX. No. We are open to considering all alternatives that are proposed in the plan. That is the reason to propose a range of alternatives. We want to hear thoughts on each of those, those different ideas, for the future of the riverways.

Mr. SMITH. So, what if that did occur, that the National Park Service was saying, "Don't advocate a no-action alternative," like what Ms. Roberts just suggested?

Mr. KNOX. My best guess is that the National Park Service people at those meetings were trying to help the public present ideas. I think we have heard loud and clear that there are many people that favor the no-action alternative, including yourself, Congressman. And so we are listening to that comment.

Mr. SMITH. That was not my question. My question is—what is the result, if the National Park Service is doing that? I mean are there any consequences to that, or do you think it is appropriate, or—

Mr. KNOX. Well, we certainly want to hear the thoughts of all citizens. And it is not appropriate to try and direct those thoughts. We want to hear those thoughts from everyone's mouths directly. And there are concerns and hopes and fears for the future of the riverways.

Mr. SMITH. I would agree. And I do want to note once again—I have noted this before when you testified—the Missouri Department of Conservation in fact submitted comments in regards to the general management plan. And they are the agency that has the responsibility for preserving our natural resources. And they recommended a no-action alternative, and enforced the current general management plan that has worked for 30 years. And I hope, once again, you will pass this on to the National Park Service, and that they will actually listen to the will of the people of Missouri and the people of this country. Thank you.

Further questions?

[No response.]

Mr. SMITH. Seeing none, thank you, witnesses. We will go to the next panel.

We have Representative Emanuel Cleaver from Missouri, and we also have Representative Edwin Fountain, the Commissioner of World War I Centennial Commission, and Mr. Victor Knox, the Associate Director of Park Planning Facilities and Lands.

Representative Cleaver, great to have you, you can proceed.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Appreciate the opportunity to be here with you and Ranking Member Grijalva. I especially want to thank during my short talk here Judge Ted Poe of Houston; Eleanor Holmes Norton, who is the delegate here from the District of Columbia; the National Park Service; and the World War I Centennial Commission; and the entire Missouri Delegation, for its work on this issue. Commemorating the centennial of World

War I has been, in many ways, a labor of love for me since I entered Congress almost 10 years ago. The World War I Memorial Act is the product of both sides of the aisle working together over the course of many years to do what is right to honor the memory of veterans who served so long ago.

As you may know, this summer marks the 100th anniversary of the start of World War I. The United States formally joined the war in April of 1917. During that time, more than 4.7 million Americans served. And, of those brave men and women, more than 116,000 soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice.

During the war, Union Station in Kansas City, Missouri, became a focal point, where train traffic peaked during World War I with 79,368 trains passing through Kansas City's Union Station, including 271 trains in 1 day. Perhaps it was the witnessing of Americans traveling the East Coast to be deployed to the war effort that prompted the citizens of the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area to build a memorial. And on that memorial, these are the words that are encased: "Lest the ages forget."

The site dedication for the Liberty Memorial became a world event, as the five allied military leaders of World War I joined the Vice President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, at the dedication in 1921. This is the only time in history that the allied leaders publicly joined together and honored those who had served and died in World War I. It is important to note that no other World War I memorial site was attended by such an impressive ensemble of dignitaries. And we have a picture of the 100,000 people—just think about this—100,000 people in 1921 gathering in one spot to listen to people without the benefit of the kind of microphones we have today. No one knew at the time that future President of the United States, Harry Truman, was in attendance.

At the official Liberty Memorial dedication in 1926, President Calvin Coolidge stated in his speech, "It has not been raised to commemorate war and victory, but, rather, the results of war and victory, which are embodied in peace and liberty." President Coolidge further stated that, "I may place the official sanction of the national government upon the most elaborate and impressive memorials that adorn our country."

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to come here. I think that we have worked across the aisles, we have worked with everybody who is interested in this issue. And, although we don't have a single person who fought in World War I who can come here today to be involved, I think it is our responsibility, as the benefiting generation, to do something in memory of what they did for us. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Representative.

Mr. Fountain.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN L. FOUNTAIN, COMMISSIONER, WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Grijalva. I am a member of the U.S. World War I Centennial Commission, which was chartered by this Congress last year to ensure a suitable observance in this country of the centennial of the war, and also to make recommendations to the Congress related to the

centennial. I am here to make one of those recommendations, which is that Congress pass H.R. 4489.

This bill relates directly to one of the primary projects that the Commission has undertaken, which is not only to designate the Liberty Tower in Kansas City as a national World War I memorial, but also to designate and improve and enhance Pershing Park, here on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, also as a national World War I memorial.

Thirty-five years ago, this country didn't think in terms of national war memorials. Most towns around the country had local memorials to Civil War or World War I and World War II veterans. To their credit, Kansas City did erect a memorial that was to all the Nation's veterans, not just the local veterans, and we commend them for it.

But then the Vietnam Veterans memorial came along, then Korea, then World War II. We now have in the Nation's Capital national memorials to the three other great wars of the 20th century, but not to World War I. This is a grave omission.

The story of the 20th century and even the 21st can't be told without telling the history of World War I and America's involvement in that war. World War I introduced America as a world power, and began what became called the American century. It was the first time that such a power went to war not for conquest, or even defense, but for the ideals of democracy and self-determination that have guided American foreign policy for the last 100 years.

Too few Americans know that more Americans died in 6 months of fighting in World War I than died in Korea or in Vietnam all together, and that during those 6 months the combat fatality rate in World War I was almost twice that of World War II. The war led directly to the second world war, and its consequences are still felt today in ongoing conflicts in places such as the former Yugoslavia, Israel, Palestine, and Iraq.

More importantly—it is important to understand not just the consequences of the war, but the causes, because without understanding how an assassin's bullet in Sarajevo in July 1914 sparked a war that all but destroyed Europe, we cannot understand how regional conflicts today in Syria, Ukraine, or elsewhere might spark another war, much less prevent that from happening.

In short, it was a horrific, world-changing war. The Centennial Commission has undertaken to educate the American people about that war, and to commemorate the service and sacrifice of our armed forces in it. A national memorial is essential to that mission.

We believe that a memorial in Washington would be most appropriately located on the Mall, but we recognize that the Commemorate Works Act prohibits any new memorials on the Mall, and we have chosen not to fight that fight. Instead, we have chosen to pursue a new memorial design at Pershing Park in front of the Willard Hotel, one block from the Capitol.

Why Pershing Park? First, because there is already a World War I commemorative element there, in the form of a statue to General John Pershing, who commanded the American expeditionary forces of World War I. Second, because, after the Mall, Pennsylvania Avenue is the most significant and symbolically important con-

course in the Nation's Capital. Pershing Park has the pride of place of anchoring the end of that avenue, opposite the Capitol, closest to the White House. If our World War I veterans are not to be honored on the Mall, then Pershing Park is the next most suitable location.

For those reasons, the Commission supports passage of H.R. 4489. I would like to urge the committee that time is of the essence here. Ideally, there would be a Presidential signing ceremony of this bill on July 28 of this year, a symbolically important date, as it marks the centennial of the start of the war.

We appreciate that this bill has been attached as an amendment to the House version of the Defense appropriations bill. We hope that might speed its passage, but we are concerned that it will get bogged down on the Senate side and then later in conference, and we would urge the committee to move the bill forward independently. A companion bill has already been introduced in the Senate, and we would very much like to see this passed and signed by the end of July.

There is the more practical reason that new memorials take time. The Commission would like to dedicate this memorial in Washington on Armistice Day 2018. That is a little more than 4 years from now. That is a very short period of time to design a memorial, to raise funds, to go through the review and permitting process, and what not. Every month we lose now hampers our cause.

I would like to emphasize that this bill imposes no cost on the Federal Government. It does not expand Park Service jurisdiction; Park Service already owns and maintains Pershing Park in Washington. This will be undertaken by the Commission with private funds. I would be happy to answer any questions that the committee might have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fountain follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF EDWIN L. FOUNTAIN, MEMBER, WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ON H.R. 4489

My name is Edwin Fountain. I am a member of the World War I Centennial Commission, which was chartered by Congress in 2013. Commission members are appointed by the President, the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the World War I Museum in Kansas City.

The WWI Centennial Commission's statutory mission is, among other things, to "plan, develop, and execute programs, projects, and activities to commemorate the centennial of World War I," and to "develop recommendations for Congress and the President for commemorating the centennial of World War I." Pub. L. 112-272, § 5(a).

In fulfillment of its statutory duty to make recommendations to Congress, the Commission is pleased to recommend that Congress pass H.R. 4489, the World War I Memorial Act of 2014. H.R. 4489 would in part authorize the Commission to proceed with one of its primary projects to commemorate the war, which is the establishment of a national World War I memorial at Pershing Park in the Nation's capital.

Throughout our country's history, towns and cities have erected their own local war memorials, be they to local veterans of the Civil War, or of World War I, or of all the Nation's wars collectively. In Washington, there are of course numerous memorials to generals and statesmen of the Revolution and the Civil War. But until the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was dedicated 30 years ago, there were no national war memorials.

Today we have on the Mall national memorials to three of the four great wars of the 20th century. There is, however, no national memorial to World War I. This

is a significant omission, given the profound nature of the causes, courses, and consequences of “the Great War.”

Understanding how a conflict between Austria and Serbia in July 1914 caused a war that all but destroyed Europe can help us understand today how a regional conflict in Syria, Ukraine or elsewhere might spark another world war—and thereby prevent it from doing so.

Although the United States entered the war late, the appearance of American soldiers and Marines on the Western Front tipped the balance of the war, and American troops demonstrated the courage, sacrifice, and feats of arms that have been the hallmark of our armed forces for over two centuries. Over 4.7 million Americans served in uniform, and 116,516 gave their lives—more than in Korea and Vietnam combined. The combat fatality rate during World War I was almost twice that of World War II. It was a horrific, world-changing war, in which our Nation played a decisive role.

World War I profoundly transformed America and the world, and America’s role in the world. It was the first great conflict of what has come to be known as “the American century.” It led directly to the Second World War, and its consequences are still felt today in ongoing conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, Israel and Palestine, and Iraq.

Few Americans today know this history, nor do they appreciate the impact World War I has on the world we live in today. Without a national memorial to World War I, we fail to properly commemorate the service of our armed forces, and we lose an opportunity to educate the American people about the war. The centennial of the war, which is now upon us, provides a timely and essential opportunity to fill that void.

H.R. 4489 would do so by dedicating two national memorials to World War I. Soon after the war the good citizens of Kansas City took it upon themselves to erect a majestic memorial, not just to their local residents who served and died in the war, but to all the Nation’s soldiers and sailors. H.R. 4489 would properly elevate the Liberty Tower, co-located with the World War I Museum in Kansas City, to national status.

H.R. 4489 would also establish a national memorial in the Nation’s capital. It would designate Pershing Park, at the far end of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol, as a national World War I memorial, and would authorize the Commission to re-develop the site into a true national memorial, worthy of that status.

The bill is consistent with the recommendation made by the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission to Congress last October. That commission recommended that “efforts to promote commemoration of World War I . . . should be undertaken through enhancements and improvements at the existing World War I Memorial in Pershing Park and better interpretation of that site so that people’s understanding of the purpose of that memorial is increased.” (Letter of Oct. 28, 2013, from Peter May, Chairman, National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, to Hon. Doc Hastings, Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources.)

By establishing these memorials, the bill would thereby honor and commemorate the veterans of World War I in a way that is commensurate with the honor we have bestowed on the veterans of other major wars, while helping future generations of Americans to know the complete history of American’s 20th-century struggle against aggression and totalitarianism.

While it may be unconventional to have two national memorials, there is no reason not to do so, and there is every reason to commemorate a profound national event such as World War I more widely, rather than less.

We also point out that H.R. 4489 does not expand the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, nor should it add to the Park Service’s budget. The existing Pershing Park already belongs to the Park Service which has responsibility for its maintenance. Improvements to the site would be paid for by private funds raised by the Commission, which would include a separate fund for ongoing costs of maintenance.

Congress would be minimizing the sacrifice of almost five million Americans who served in World War I, including 116,000 dead, if it did not honor them in the Nation’s capital, as well as in Kansas City, in the same manner as the veterans of the wars that followed.

Finally, we ask that Congress move promptly to pass this bill. July 28, 2014 will mark the 100th anniversary of the start of the war. The Commission hopes that the President would sign this bill on that symbolically important date. More to the point, designing and constructing memorials takes time. In order to dedicate a new memorial by Veterans Day in November 2018, which will mark the centennial of the armistice that ended the war, the process needs to begin now. We as a Nation cannot delay any longer.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Representative Cleaver, you are free to go, or you can join us on the dais, whichever you would like.

We still have Mr. Knox to testify on this bill, H.R. 4489.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's view on H.R. 4489. I would like to submit our full statement for the record, and summarize our views quickly.

H.R. 4489 would designate memorials to the service of members of the United States armed forces in World War I. This bill would redesignate Pershing Park in the District of Columbia as the National World War I Memorial, and allow for the enhancement of that park to further honor the service of members of the United States Army in World War I.

The bill would also designate Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as the National World War I Museum and Memorial. The Department supports H.R. 4489, with amendments that are described in our written statement.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I would be glad to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. No questions. Thank you.

Next we will have Colonel William E. Weber, Chairman of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation, to testify on H.R. 318.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. WEBER, COLONEL, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED; CHAIRMAN, KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Colonel WEBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to extend my previously submitted written testimony.

The light blue blazers that you see in front of you represent the Korean War Veterans Association, of which there are 2.1 million left who served in Korea. And many of them, like myself, are also veterans of World War II and Vietnam. Therefore, we represent a unique block of American veterans.

For us, though, the Korean War becomes a key point, because it is the first time in the history of our Nation that a war was fought that wasn't declared, and that the United States led a coalition of nations against aggression. That has become the pattern for U.S. participation in world conflicts since that time. Therefore, it occupies a very unique place in history.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that if Public Law 99-572 had been complied with, as was written, I wouldn't be here today. The law stated specifically that the Memorial was intended to honor those members of the armed forces who served in Korea, particularly those who were killed in action, missing in action, or prisoners of war.

During the negotiations for designing the Memorial, I served as a member of the group appointed by President Reagan, the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board, in negotiating with the various elements and agencies of the Federal Government that have control over what goes on the Mall. At that point in time, there was a great deal of controversy because of the Vietnam Wall. The veterans of Vietnam felt that their wall appropriately honored

those who sacrificed their lives, but didn't honor those who served. As a result, the wall was changed, the Memorial was changed. In our case for the Korean memorial, we were unable to successfully include a means of identifying our killed in action because of the controversy—and, more specifically, because of the reasoning that they just didn't want another wall on the Mall.

Today, at this point in time, there are 36,574 American dead from Korea whose names do not appear anywhere. Yes, you may find them on a Web site, but it is not correct, it is incomplete. There are names of the missing in action in the Punchbowl in Hawaii. There are also 6,000 American dead buried in Hawaii. The rest of the American dead from the Korean War are buried all over the United States. There is not one central point where Americans and foreigners visiting our memorial can visualize the extent of the cost of the war in Korea: more specifically, on an average, every month for 36 months, 1,000 dead and 3,000 wounded.

H.R. 318 will correct that discrepancy. It will not cost the U.S. Government one cent. The money will be coming from private sources. The plan is unique. It envisions a glass wall of remembrance that would encircle the rear area of the Korean Memorial. It would give closure to the Memorial, but it would also continue to fully integrate it into the Mall, as a whole. It would not bar vision from the Memorial to the rest of the Mall.

We feel that a precedent exists for this. There have been changes to memorials on the Mall. No law is immutable. It is in the power of Congress to correct an error. That is what H.R. 318 will do, it will correct an error of failure to comply with the original law that authorized a memorial.

Please don't let this bill die here. Let it go to the full Congress, and let the people, through their Congress, express their wishes. And you will find that their wishes are they want the names of the dead in Korea to be recorded for the people who visit the Mall and the Memorial to see and visualize the cost of that war. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Colonel Weber follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. WEBER, COLONEL—USA (RET.); CHAIRMAN,
KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION ON H.R. 318

I am Colonel William E. Weber, USA-Ret, Chairman of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation, Inc. (KWVMFnd). I am here today to testify in support of H.R. 318. The KWVMFnd is a 501(C)(3) non-profit, tax exempt organization with the dual mission of ensuring there will always be the means available to guarantee appropriate maintenance of the Memorial and to ensure that a benchmark of the 20th Century, that is the Korean War and America's role, become a permanent part of our national consciousness. Our Board, chartered in December 1995, is composed in the main by those who were members of the presidentially appointed Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board whose mission is as covered below.

H.R. 318, 113th Congress, was initiated by Congressman Ralph Hall, 4-TX, at our behest in an attempt to complete the Memorial's message as was intended by P.L. 99-572 which authorized the Memorial. As of June 5, 2014, it had 53 co-sponsors. Further, it has the full support of the Korean War Veterans Association, Inc., a Congressional Chartered Veterans Organization of Korean War Veterans. In addition, it has the support of many of the Fraternal Unit Veterans Associations that have Korean War battle honors and, as well, family members of those Killed in Action.

P.L. 99-572, specifically details the original intent of the Congress. Such is not fulfilled by the current Korean War Veterans Memorial which, though a magnificent work of art, lacks both the specific and subliminal message the Congress specified. Controversy generated by reaction to the Vietnam Memorial and the resultant philosophy generated thereby, precluded the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory

Board from prevailing in the inclusion of naming of the Killed in Action in final design negotiations.

P.L. 99-572 called for the President to appoint a Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board (KWVMAB), whose mission, in part, was to, “(1)—*recommending the site and selecting the design with the approval of the American Battle Monuments Commission*—.” In effect this required selecting a design that would also be accepted and approved by the then National Capital Memorial Commission (NCMC), the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the Fine Arts Commission (FAC).

When the specific language of P.L. 99-572 was being negotiated in order to ensure the Korean War Veterans Memorial gave appropriate recognition to the sacrifices of American Soldiery the phrase, “*to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Korean War, particularly those who were killed in action, are still missing in action, or were held as prisoners of war.*”, became a dominant element of the law and a major element to the intended theme of the Memorial.

As part of a nationwide competition the KWVMAB reviewed over 500 submitted designs none of which fully met the requirements of P.L. 99-572, and thus, selected one that held the promise of appropriate modification. In keeping with P.L. 99-572 and the overwhelming wishes of the Nation’s Korean War Veterans population, the KWVMAB studied means to meet the specific requirements of P.L. 99-572 (as underlined in the above), and satisfy the above named Commissions which held veto rights over any design. The KWVMAB was not able to resolve the primary requirement of P.L. 99-572 due to a seeming atmosphere of not wanting another ‘Wall on the Mall’!

As a result, though a truly magnificent Memorial which clearly honors those who served in the Korean War, it does not appropriately honor those who *sacrificed* so much in the war! The visitor leaves with a sense of wonder at the magnificent artistry of the Memorial—but absent any sense of the full message it was intended to convey.

Recording the KIA names and WIA and POW by number for posterity on a glass Wall of Remembrance, will thereby personalize the numbers and focus on the enormity of their sacrifice (over 36,574 KIA (which includes the MIA)), 103,134 WIA and 7,245 POW. In terms of percentage of casualties, the Korean War was the bloodiest major foreign war in U.S. history—1 in 9 for Korea versus 1 in 12 in WWII and 1 in 17 in Vietnam.

As well, Korean soldiers known as KATUSA (Korean Augmentation to United States Army), who served alongside their U.S. comrades in U.S. units, and gave their lives deserve recognition. Over 9000+ KATUSA were KIA. Their sacrifice would have otherwise been American Soldiery whom they replaced. Their names are lost to history but their numbers deserve recognition for *their sacrifice would otherwise have been American lives*.

Given the state-of-the-art at the time the Memorial design was finalized a Wall of Remembrance may have been an architectural barrier isolating the Memorial from the Mall and may have been incorrectly interpreted as copying or detracting from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Such thinking was specious given the totality of the theme of the Korean War Veterans Memorial.

Today an architectural ‘barrier’ is not a bar to a Wall, for a Glass Wall allows the Memorial to be integral to the Mall while still giving it a sense of closure and giving full meaning to the intended purpose of the Memorial. Contrary to the present pattern of visitation, the Wall will induce visitors to encircle the entire Memorial as opposed to current visitation habits which encourage encircling only the line of sculptures.

As to why the language in H.R. 318 is so specific, it is necessary to ensure that the Wall presents the absolute versus just the subliminal message that now exists and is too subtle to be understood. This is the purpose of any War Memorial! If visitation to a Memorial requires that visitors must have a brochure to gain full appreciation for the ‘why’ and ‘what’ of the Memorial, it fails in its purpose!

The Korean War remains “The Forgotten War” in the history of our Nation. Mindful that this war was a benchmark of the 20th Century and notwithstanding the magnificence of the Memorial, it is inappropriate that the extent of our Soldiery’s sacrifice remains unknown and that their sacrifice gave birth to the catalyst that generated the downfall of the USSR’s goal to dominate the world.

Enactment of H.R. 318 will give remedy to the missing link in the Memorial and give honored and deserved recognition to a generation of American Soldiery who have been Forgotten! Just as surely as we fought WWII to save the world FOR DEMOCRACY so too, did we fight the Korean War to save the world FROM communism! The cost of that battle in terms of the sacrifice by American soldiery is a relative unknown in the American psyche and history!

Bureaucratic objection to adding the Wall of Remembrance to the Memorial seems fixated on the premise that once a Memorial is dedicated it is exempt from any modification or addition. Clearly, precedents exist which negate that premise!

The theme of the Korean War Veterans Memorial is that 'FREEDOM IS NOT FREE!' Adding the Wall of Remembrance will finally give meaning to that theme! The Memorial is the only means remaining to ensure future generations of Americans and foreign visitors will understand that the Korean War is a Benchmark of the 20th Century—the human cost of which should not be unknown!

REBUTTAL BY CHAIRMAN (COL [RET] WILLIAM E. WEBER), KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC., TO TESTIMONY OF MR. VICTOR KNOX, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NPS, U.S. DOI ON H.R. 318

(Note: Rebuttal remarks in bold follow disputed DOI testimony.)

STATEMENT OF VICTOR KNOX, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CONCERNING H.R. 318, TO AUTHORIZE A WALL OF REMEMBRANCE AS PART OF THE KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL AND TO ALLOW CERTAIN PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO FUND THAT WALL OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 318, to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance.

The Department opposes H.R. 318 because it would significantly alter the character of the existing Korean War Veterans Memorial, and it is inconsistent with the Commemorative Works Act.

(Enactment of H.R. 318 would enhance, not alter, the character of the existing Memorial. To the visitor, the Memorial presents a stirring work of art, but as such it is incomplete, ignores the intent of law and fails to adequately present the intended theme of the Memorial that 'Freedom Is Not Free'!)

H.R. 318 would amend Public Law 99-572 to expand upon the original purpose and design of the Korean War Veterans Memorial. The bill adds new subjects for commemoration and would require the display of certain information at the memorial about members of the U.S. Armed Forces who served in the Korean Conflict. Also, the bill would require the display of information at the memorial about members of the Korean armed forces and other Korean military personnel as well as the 20 other non-U.S. forces that were part of the United Nations Command who served in the Korean Conflict.

(H.R. 318 does not amend P.L. 99-572! It would ensure that the basic requirement of P.L. 99-572, as directed by Congress, would be honored. The Congress stipulated that the Memorial was to honor those who served in Korea 'particularly those killed in action, missing in action or prisoners of war'.)

The Korean War Veterans Memorial commemorates the sacrifices of the 5.8 million Americans who served in the U.S. armed services during the 3-year period of the Korean War. The Memorial also recognizes the participation of the 22 nations who served as United Nations contributors. During the Korean War's relatively short duration from June 25, 1950, to July 27, 1953, 54,246 Americans died. Of these, 8,200 are listed as missing in action, lost, or buried at sea. In addition, 103,284 were wounded during the conflict.

(The current means of recognizing U.N. contributors to the war fails to do so! Visitation patterns miss or ignore the U.N. Stones. The 54,246 U.S. dead are worldwide deaths during 25 Jun 50-27 Jul 53. KIA in Korea is 36,547! In brief, war zone casualties averaged 1,000 KIA/Month and 3,000 WIA per month!)

The Memorial was designed, constructed and completed by its legislatively designated sponsor, the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC) and the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board, with public involvement throughout. It was dedicated on July 27, 1995.

The Memorial's design, and each of its features down to its plantings, is symbolic. The Memorial is the culmination of years of work by the ABMC, and careful reviews, followed by revisions, and ultimately approvals reached by the National Park Service and other Federal entities including the National Capital Planning Commission and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. This painstaking and public process began with the competition design, and resulted in the completed Memorial we know today. The Memorial should not now be changed to include the engraving of names of Americans who served in that conflict. The opportunity to mimic the design characteristics present at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was purposefully avoided when the design was requested during an open, international design competition.

(It was the controversy of the Vietnam Memorial that inhibited [but did not prevent], considering names at the Korean War Memorial! The issue that the Vietnam Memorial honored only sacrifice and not service, the public controversy that resulted and the need to modify the Memorial by adding the three sculptures, produced an aura of wanting to avoid a similar controversy. Ergo, though there was popular and public demand for naming the fallen, it was impossible to overcome the resistance to such from NCPC and FAC, even though attempts were made. It is not factual to claim that no effort was made by the KWVMAbrd to include naming the fallen!)

The concept of engraving names at this Memorial was considered extensively when the Memorial was being designed. The ABMC and the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board with the Department's concurrence, advised against the incorporation of engraved names at the Memorial. Both agencies arrived at this decision upon reflection of years of experience with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Inscribing names is a lengthy and painstaking process even when it goes smoothly. But more important, as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial experience showed, there is not always agreement on those names to be included and those names that are not, and this has led to public contention and controversy. Choosing some names and omitting others causes a place of solace to become a source of hurt. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial honors all who served in that conflict, but only the names of the 58,272 killed within the combat zone are engraved on the Wall. This meant that those killed by a fire on a Navy ship just outside the zone were not eligible to have their names engraved on the wall—a difficult message for their survivors to accept.

(This argument simply affirms that the 'exception proves the rule'! Killed in Action means just what it implies! It does not infer that an auto accident in Japan can be a direct result of enemy action! The point at which the KWVMAbrd consented—not unanimously—to exclude a 'name' wall was when it was presented with having to choose between such and the Mural Wall. Having both was aggressively opposed by FAC, due in part to the then controversy pertaining to the Vietnam War Memorial.)

The ABMC and the Department felt the lessons learned at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial must not be ignored, that a different type of commemoration must occur at the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and that the Memorial should be representative in design and not include individual names. As a compromise to the Korean War veterans who wanted the names engraved, ABMC created the Korean War Honor Roll, which is an electronic registry of names. Visitors have access to this registry from the Internet or at the kiosks at the Memorial. A kiosk containing the Korean War Honor Roll stands at the west entrance of the Memorial. It is serviced by a National Park Service ranger, who provides assistance to visitors. The Honor Roll computer contains the names of all military personnel who lost their lives during the Korean War, including the individual's name, service, rank, service number, date of birth, hometown or county of entry into the service, cause of death, and date of death. If the information is furnished to ABMC, the Honor Roll includes the serviceman's unit, his awards, the circumstances surrounding his death or his going missing in action and a photograph. The ABMC also has the names of those missing engraved at the Courts of the Missing at the Honolulu Memorial.

(The Korean War Honor Roll at the Kiosk is useless to all visitors except those who know a name of a KIA to be entered for a printout of the data on that individual. It is a given that the almost 4 million annual visitors to the Memorial neither have the time nor information to utilize the Kiosk. The only beneficiaries are family members! Ergo, visitation to the Memorial DOES NOT adequately portray the sacrifice inherent in FREEDOM IS NOT FREE!)

The Korean War Veterans Memorial is located near the Lincoln Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, DC, in an area designated by Congress in the Commemorative Works Act as the Reserve—an area in which no new commemorative works shall be located. As Congress noted in the law creating the Reserve, “. . . the great cross-axis of the Mall in the District of Columbia . . . is a substantially completed work of civic art; and . . . to preserve the integrity of the Mall, a reserve area should be designated . . . where the siting of new commemorative works is prohibited.” The Korean War Veterans Memorial is a completed work of civic art in this special landscape of the Reserve. Moreover, we cannot ignore the practical effect of this legislation. Essentially, the Memorial wall would be a second Korean War Veterans Memorial, effectively thwarting the intent of the Commemorative Works Act to prohibit new memorials within the Reserve and would be an addition that would significantly alter the character of the existing Memorial. And this second memorial would have the effect of violating the Commemorative Works Act prohibition on interfering or encroaching on an existing memorial.

(Another specious argument! Adding the Wall of Remembrance to the Korean War Veterans Memorial does not CREATE a new Memorial—it COMPLETES an existing Memorial! Further, to suggest that the Wall of Remembrance would alter the character of the existing Memorial ignores that the existing Memorial fails to convey the level of sacrifice which the Congress directed it so do! In truth adding the Wall of Remembrance will ensure that visitation to the Memorial will ensure that the subliminal message of both service and sacrifice is conveyed!)

We feel very strongly that the Korean War Veterans Memorial, like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, exists to recall the exemplary service and sacrifice of outstanding Americans, and this memorial has already been completed as it stands today. The Korean War Veterans Memorial is a place of honor and dignity and we should avoid any intrusions that will become a source of contention or controversy.

(The Vietnam Veterans Memorial required an addition to complete the intended actual and subliminal message. As originally dedicated the Vietnam War Memorial acknowledged and honored ONLY those who SACRIFICED, not those who SERVED! Clearly, such ignored the totality of the impact of the war on our Nation and people! A similar, though converse situation pertains for the Korean War Veterans Memorial! It honors only those who SERVED, not those who SACRIFICED! Adding the Wall of Remembrance will finally complete the Korean War Veterans Memorial as was originally intended by P.L. 99-572! Adding the Wall will mute the controversy that still pertains amongst veterans of the Korean War and their families!)

That concludes my prepared testimony on H.R. 318, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Colonel Weber.

Mr. Knox, would you testify on H.R. 318 and H.R. 4489?

Mr. KNOX. I spoke to 4489 previously.

Mr. SMITH. 4049. Representative Duffy's bill and also Representative Hall's bill. We haven't received comments on those two.

Mr. KNOX. OK, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 318 and H.R. 4049.

H.R. 318 would authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial. The Department opposes H.R. 318 because it would significantly alter the character of the existing Korean War Veterans Memorial in a manner inconsistent with the Commemorative Works Act.

We feel very strongly that the Korean War Veterans Memorial, like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, exist to recall the exemplary service and sacrifice of outstanding Americans. And this memorial has already been completed as it stands today. The Memorial's design and each of its features, down to its plantings, is symbolic.

The Memorial is the culmination of years of work by the American Battlefield Monuments Commission and careful reviews followed by revisions and ultimate approvals by the National Park Service, National Capital Planning Commission, and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts.

This painstaking and public process began with competition design, and resulted in the completed memorial we know today. The Memorial should not now be changed to include engraving of names of Americans who served in that conflict.

The opportunity to mimic the design characteristics present at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was purposely avoided when the design was requested during an open international design competition. The concept of engraving names at this memorial was considered extensively when the Memorial was being designed. The American Battlefield Monuments Commission and the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board advised against the incorporation of engraved names at the Memorial. Both agencies arrived at this decision upon reflection of years of experience with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Inscribing names is a lengthy and painstaking process, even when it goes smoothly. But, more important, as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial experience showed, there is not always agreement on those names to be included and those names that are not. And this has led to public contention and controversy.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial honors all who served in that conflict, but only the names of 58,272 killed within the combat are engraved on the wall. This meant that those killed by a fire on a Navy ship just outside the zone were not eligible to have their names engraved on the wall: a difficult message for those survivors to accept.

And I need to find 4049. H.R. 4049 would adjust the boundary of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light.

The Park manages six historic light stations and a total of eight standing light towers, more than any other unit of the National Park System. The Department supports the enactment of H.R. 4049, with amendments that are described in my written statement.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. I appreciate any questions you might have. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Knox, could you also testify on 4527, as well?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, Mr. Chairman. H.R. 4527 would remove use restriction on land formerly part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine. The property was conveyed in 1951 for school purposes. If the property is no longer used for a school in the future, the town would like to retain ownership, and continue to use the property for other community purposes. The legislation would allow them to do so.

The Department could support H.R. 4527, if it is amended to provide for a reversion of the property to the Federal Government if it is not used for a public recreation, education, or similar purposes, or if it degrades or adversely affects Park values. We would be happy to work with the committee on language for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I appreciate any questions you might have.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Colonel Weber, I just have a quick question. The Korean War Memorial is one of the most popular and beloved memorials that we have out there. Why do you think it is appropriate to open it back up to make these changes?

Colonel WEBER. I think, sir, that the people who visit the Korean War Veterans Memorial are inspired by a magnificent work of art. They are not moved by the theme "Freedom is Not Free." They don't understand what that means when they visit that memorial. What did it cost to have freedom? And the answer is it cost 36,574 American lives. The blood that was shed is what makes the Korean War Veterans Memorial missing an important part. And the law itself demanded that part be included. It specifically stated acknowledgment of those killed in action.

When a visitor comes to the Memorial, there is a subliminal message there. There definitely is. But it is so subtle that the average visitor doesn't get the intent of the message. They were supposed to encircle the Pool of Remembrance and reflect, while encircling the Pool of Remembrance, on what it cost for that memorial to exist. The problem is the visitation of the Memorial, less than 1 out of 200 visitors even encircle the pool, because there is nothing to attract them there. And if placid water is supposed to cause reflection, then why is the pool drained in the winter time? It obviously doesn't serve its function if it is drained.

The problem that we have is the traffic pattern in the Memorial is such that when visitors enter the Memorial, they are immediately awed by the line of 19 sculptures, and justifiably so, because they are magnificent. They go up to the apex of that triangle, they read the homily at the foot of it, they see the panel that says, "Freedom is Not Free," and they turn back and go down the other wall along the mural wall. And then they depart the Memorial.

Now, the Park Service will tell you that there is a kiosk at which the names of the dead can be found. Not completely correct. The only names in the kiosk are those that the family has specifically asked be entered there. And it is demonstrably evident that the almost four million visitors to the Memorial every year could not possibly, one at a time, make use of the kiosk, even to look up a name, if you even knew a name to look up.

The simple truth is, as magnificent as the Memorial is, it lacks the subliminal message being heard by the visitor. Adding the Wall of Remembrance will provide that message. It will not change the complex of the Memorial, it will enhance it. It will make the Memorial what it was supposed to be: something to honor not only those who served, but those who sacrificed. And that is what is lacking.

And I say again I spent 9 years of my life on the board that helped design the Memorial, and it is not true that we didn't ask for a name wall. Ultimately, we had to choose between one of two walls: a mural wall or a name wall. We chose the mural wall because that became America's mantlepiece.

The solution for the dead doesn't work. That message is not transmitted to the visitor. And it will not be transmitted to future generations. And the whole reason for freedom not being free will be lost.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Colonel.

Colonel WEBER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SMITH. I have no further questions. I do want to thank each and every one for their testimony. Definitely appreciate the testimony of the folks that served in our armed forces. And we thank you very much.

Members of the subcommittee may have additional questions for the witnesses, and we ask you to respond to these in writing. The hearing record will be open for 10 days to receive these responses. If there is no further business, without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[ADDITIONAL MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO ON H.R. 4283

First, I'd like to thank Chairman Bishop and Ranking Member Grijalva for allowing me to testify today in support of H.R. 4283. Also, thank you to members of the subcommittee for your attendance.

H.R. 4283 is intended to authorize the use of maintenance equipment and the replacement of some outdated and potentially hazardous energy facilities at the River of No Return Lodge in Smith Gulch on the Salmon River in Idaho. As it currently sits, the River of No Return Lodge is a small outfitter on the Salmon River that provides a unique recreational experience operating under a Forest Service permit. Unfortunately, the Forest Service does not believe it has clear authorization to permit the use of necessary maintenance or replacement of facilities. This proposed bill is an effort to clarify Congress' intent in legislation passed in 2004 to retain the basic characteristics of the Lodge without substantially altering the existing use.

This legislation makes it clear that the owners of the Lodge are authorized to use weed trimmers, chainsaws, and other maintenance equipment needed for the general upkeep of the lodge. It also will allow the outfitter to reduce or eliminate his reliance on propane fuel and replace it with modest renewable energy sources. I believe H.R. 4283 is consistent with the goals set forth by this subcommittee to make recreational opportunities available, as well as leaving our lands in even better shape for future generations of Americans.

It should be noted that a few small changes will need to be made during markup of H.R. 4283 to address both technical corrections and concerns raised by interested parties. The bill, once amended, will have been crafted with the sentiments of both the Idaho Conservation League and the Wilderness Society in mind. We trust that the Forest Service will faithfully grant authorization for the maintenance and replacement activities without the burden of unreasonable environmental review costs.

I look forward to amending H.R. 4283 with these changes at a future mark up.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify regarding this common sense legislation that has been carefully crafted with the stakeholder's views in mind, so the operator of the River of No Return Lodge can perform the fundamental maintenance and replace outdated energy sources needed to carry out his small business with respect to the existing law. Again, thank you Chairman Bishop and Ranking Member Grijalva for the opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 4283.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HON. SEAN P. DUFFY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN ON H.R. 4049

Good morning. Thank you Chairman Bishop and Ranking Member Grijalva for holding this hearing today. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 4049, the Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act, which will facilitate the transfer of a lighthouse in Ashland, Wisconsin from the Coast Guard to the National Park Service.

Next year will mark the 100th Anniversary of the Ashland Breakwater Light, a lighthouse that has stood strong on Lake Superior's shores, guiding ships through dark nights and storms and welcoming travelers back home. I was blessed to be able

to raise my family, with my beautiful wife Rachel, in Ashland. Having spent years in the community, I know the importance of this light not only as a symbol of Ashland but as a major part of the local economy. The Ashland Light is listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 2007 and is an important part of Ashland area tourism, recreation, and education.

This historic site faces an uncertain future, however, with the Coast Guard looking to give up management. The Coast Guard announced its intent to give up ownership of the Ashland Light in May of 2012. No public or private entity aside from the National Park Service's Apostle Islands National Lakeshore has expressed credible interest in obtaining and maintaining the Ashland Light. In the absence of legislation, however, there is no guarantee it would be maintained as a historic property or that it would be available for public education or access.

H.R. 4049, the Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act, will allow the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore to maintain this lighthouse—alongside the other eight lights it already manages. It does this by simply adjusting the boundary of the Apostle Island National Lakeshore (APIS) to include the Ashland Light itself.

All of the other light stations within the boundaries of the Apostle Islands were transferred to the National Park Service from the Coast Guard in 1986. The Ashland Light was not included in the 1986 transfer, however, because it was not inside the park boundary, the USCG was actively maintaining it, and its future was not at issue at the time.

I have worked closely with National Park Service staff, as well as the local recreational community, to strike a balance that allows for the transfer of the lighthouse itself while preventing additional Federal rules and regulations from affecting *any* recreation on the waters surrounding the Ashland Light. Additionally, the Coast Guard will maintain access to the Ashland Light to maintain it as an aid to navigation and the Army Corps of Engineers will still maintain the breakwater on which the light stands.

We know all too well that disagreements between agencies can often get in the way of the best interest of the community. For this reason, I specifically included language to ensure all the agencies involved—the Park Service, the Coast Guard, and the Army Corps—cooperate in their operations to ensure that all of their needs surrounding the lighthouse are met.

This legislation is the result of close collaboration with the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore—particularly Superintendent Bob Krumenaker, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, the Wisconsin Historical Society, the Ashland Chamber of Commerce and Economic Development groups, the City and County of Ashland, and the local outdoor recreational community. And this legislation has received near unanimous, bipartisan support from the Wisconsin House delegation and Senator Baldwin and Senator Johnson have introduced companion legislation in the Senate.

Additionally, I want to pay special recognition to a group of students who are in Washington, DC today—all the way from Ashland Middle School on a school field trip. I'm really glad that the timing of their visit coincided with this hearing, and I'm glad they will be seeing the democratic process first-hand this week, especially on an issue that is important to them in their hometown.

Finally, I have several letters of support for H.R. 4049 that I would like to submit for the record.

I look forward to advancing Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act and helping to preserve this piece of history for generations to come. I urge the committee to pass this legislation quickly and appreciate your support today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY REP. SEAN DUFFY ON H.R. 4049

ASHLAND AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ASHLAND, WI,
FEBRUARY 8, 2014.

Hon. SEAN DUFFY,
1208 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REP. DUFFY:

I would like to express the Ashland Area Chamber of Commerce's support for H.R. 4049, the Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act. We particularly appreciate your listening to our important concerns regarding the ¼ mile boundary sur-

rounding the lighthouse and preventing any additional Federal rules and regulations from affecting *any* recreation on the waters surrounding the Ashland Light. The Chequamegon Bay is known for the world-class fisheries within its 33,000 acres, and the area surrounding the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light is one of the best and most well-known hot spots for year round fishing. It is imperative that there be no restrictions imposed by the National Park Service that would hinder access any time of the year to this area. Not only is the economic impact from four-season fishing important for our tourism industry, the freedom for our tax-paying residents to utilize the area around the lighthouse is of the utmost importance as well.

Again, thank you for protecting Ashland's recreational opportunities and at the same time, allowing for the protection of the beautiful Ashland Harbor Breakwater Lighthouse.

Sincerely,

MARY MCPHETRIDGE,
Executive Director.

CITY OF ASHLAND,
ASHLAND, WI,
FEBRUARY 11, 2014.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN, *Senator*,
717 Hart Senate Building,
Washington, DC 20510.

Hon. SEAN DUFFY, *Representative*,
1513 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR SENATOR BALDWIN & REPRESENTATIVE DUFFY:

I am in favor of transferring the Ashland Light House which is located in the harbor of Ashland from the United States Coast Guard to the Apostle Islands National Lake Shore National Park Service.

All of the other (six) light stations within the boundaries of the Apostle Islands National Lake Shore (APIS) were transferred to the NPS from the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) in 1986 as a result of PL 99-497. All six light stations, which include eight standing light towers, are listed on the National Register.

The Ashland Light was built in 1915 and was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2007. The Ashland Light was not included in the 1986 transfer because it was not inside the park boundary, the USCG was actively maintaining it, and its future was not at issue at the time.

The Ashland Light transfer will be a gateway to the Apostle Islands National Lake Shore right here in the city of Ashland. It will be part of the tour that so many make as they explore the light houses in the Park. It will give the Park another opportunity to tell the story and importance of the APIS to many travelers who are passing through which may extend their stay and give them a reason to return for a longer visit.

Just recently, the city of Ashland concluded negotiations with Canadian National Railroad to purchase the 1700 ft ore dock base located in the Ashland Harbor. The base could be the departing point for tours to the light and the activity created would do much to maintain the harbor designation as a commercial harbor. The designation is very important for the continued economic development of the harbor as a commercial shipping point on Lake Superior. The light can be the guide to not only the ships entering the harbor, but it will also be the light guiding the city to future development of the Ashland Harbor shoreline which fronts the entire city.

The Apostle Islands National Lake Shore has the largest and finest collection of six lighthouses in the country. Let us make the Ashland Harbor Light number seven.

Sincerely,

BILL WHALEN,
Mayor.

WISCONSIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
MADISON, WI,
FEBRUARY 18, 2014.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN, *Senator*,
717 Hart Senate Building,
Washington, DC 20510.

Hon. SEAN DUFFY, *Representative*,
1513 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC 20515.

I write in support of the continued preservation of the Ashland breakwater light. The breakwater light has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places, our Nation's official Federal list of properties worthy of preservation. As Wisconsin's State Historic Preservation Officer, I understand the Federal Government's commitment to historic preservation as a means to celebrate the rich heritage of this nation.

Wisconsin has a deep and rich maritime history and our impressive collection of historic lighthouses is a potent symbol of the historic importance of way finding to the history of Great Lakes navigation and commerce, and the economic development of Wisconsin.

The Ashland breakwater light joins a nationally important collection of six historically significant lights within the boundaries of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. Together those lighthouses tell stories of the Great Lakes that enrich the experience of Wisconsin visitors and add to our understanding of America's culture and history. This story knits together large swaths of the Wisconsin experience, including transportation, recreation, commerce, maritime history and our culture and life ways.

For those reasons, I strongly support efforts that will lead to the continued preservation of this important historic structure.

Sincerely,

JIM DRAEGER,
State Historic Preservation Officer/Director of Outreach.

APOSTLE ISLANDS HISTORIC PRESERVATION CONSERVANCY,
BAYFIELD, WI,
MAY 15, 2014.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN, *Senator*,
717 Hart Senate Building,
Washington, DC 20510.

Hon. SEAN DUFFY, *Representative*,
1513 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR SENATOR BALDWIN & REPRESENTATIVE DUFFY:

On behalf of the Apostle Islands Historic Preservation Conservancy, I am pleased to write in support of S. 2031 and H.R. 4049, the bills you have introduced to preserve the historically significant Ashland Breakwater Lighthouse. The Conservancy promotes the preservation, restoration and public appreciation of cultural and historic resources of the Apostle Island Region. The Lighthouse is a very important part of the regional history, and it is deserving of protection. Your foresight in introducing this legislation will hopefully lead to the long-term protection of the Ashland lighthouse and its inclusion with the other lighthouses of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

As you pursue this legislation, we encourage you to consider the opportunities for community and non-federal support for, and involvement in, the preservation and maintenance of this icon. The National Park Service greatly benefits from such assistance. There are many management tools available to provide for non-federal assistance with historically significant resources like the Lighthouse. In fact, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has identified the Apostle Islands National lakeshore as one the units within the National Park System that is best positioned to take advantage of historic leasing and similar tools to supplement the federal capacity for carrying out NPS's important mission of historic preservation. The Conservancy has been pleased to assist in that role, and we are willing to help explore

the opportunities for leasing, partnerships and cooperative management arrangements that may be available for the Lighthouse and other historic properties.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting the historic and cultural heritage of the Apostles Islands, and please let us know if we can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. DAHL,
Chairman.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE UMATILLA INDIAN
RESERVATION ON H.R. 4272

BACKGROUND

In 1855, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) ceded 6.4 million acres of its aboriginal lands in exchange for the Umatilla Indian Reservation and reserved a number of significant off-reservation rights for our members, forever. Among these are the rights to hunt, fish and gather our “First Foods” on lands ceded by the CTUIR to the Federal Government, including the Umatilla National Forest, Malheur National Forest and the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest in northeastern Oregon and southwest Washington.

Our First Foods include, but are not limited to, water, anadromous and resident fish, big game such as deer and elk, roots, and berries. These resources can all be negatively impacted by excessive road development and unregulated public use. We support a balance between protection of these resources and access to them for tribal members and non-tribal peoples alike.

The CTUIR continuously seeks to improve the quality of natural resources and First Foods in these areas and is consulted on a government-to-government basis in Federal environmental processes such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). From 2007–2012, the CTUIR actively worked with the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Oregon and others on development of a Travel Management Plan (TMP) for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

The CTUIR worked to ensure that the Forest Service’s decision in the TMP was consistent with its statutory obligations pursuant to NEPA, the Travel Management Rule, and the ESA, as well as the Federal trust responsibility. The CTUIR believed that the final TMP for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest met these obligations while continuing to provide reasonable public access. The proposed TMP are essential to the protection of endangered species and their habitats as well as providing elk security to address regional elk distribution problems and reduce elk impacts to adjacent private lands (e.g. crop and hay losses).

Due to pressure from those who disagreed with the final decision, the Forest Service withdrew the Record of Decision for the TMP. No action has taken place since.

H.R. 4272

The “Forest Access in Rural Communities Act” would cease all implementation of the Travel Management Rule across the country and require the concurrence of affected counties before individual TMP’s are implemented.

The CTUIR understands the interest in providing transparent consultation with local governments about Federal land management decisions. However, we believe this legislation over extends that goal and compromises critical obligations and responsibilities held by the Federal Government on behalf of the CTUIR and a diverse public of USFS stakeholders who enjoy non-motorized public-lands experiences.

First, by subjecting Federal land management decisions to county approval, this legislation would prevent the Federal Government from fulfilling its trust responsibility to the CTUIR, particularly as it pertains to the tribes’ off-reservation treaty-reserved rights and resources. It is important to understand that our Treaty did not “give” the tribal people those rights to fish, hunt, and gather foods and medicines. They are rights that we have had and exercised since time immemorial.

The CTUIR is a sovereign tribal government as recognized by the United States in the Treaty of 1855. In the Treaty, our ancestors reserved those rights to ensure that the tribe’s future generations would be able to maintain and exercise our traditions and customs. In the withdrawn Wallowa-Whitman TMP, the Forest Service had, through consultation with the CTUIR, made certain decisions designed to uphold its trust responsibility to protect off-reservation treaty resources, including, for

instance, the closure of certain roads to provide elk security and control the spread of noxious weeds.

H.R. 4272, while intended to provide a greater voice to local forest users, would inadvertently enact a dangerous precedent striking at the heart of the unique legal relationship between the Federal Government and federally recognized tribes. The bill would upend Federal law to effectively give counties a veto authority over implementation of the Federal Government's trust responsibility in certain cases. Counties have no established trust responsibility to federally recognized tribes, and while we often find ourselves working cooperatively toward mutually beneficial goals, counties simply do not have the same duty as the Federal Government to protect treaty-reserved rights and resources.

Further, the bill would interfere with the government-to-government relationship between the tribes and the United States as acknowledged in the treaty, statutes and Executive Order 13175 which recognizes the obligation of the Forest Service to consult with the CTUIR when taking actions impacting tribal rights and resources.

Such a significant shift in the relationship between tribes, counties and the Federal Government is wholly disproportionate to the underlying concern: the disagreement among off-road users and county officials with the Forest Service over access management decisions. The USFS has an obligation to be responsive to a diverse public—including tribes—with interests in varied and multiple forest uses; this legislation would provide disproportionate influence to a subset of the public.

Existing law already provides extensive avenues for opponents to appeal and litigate the Forest Service's decisions regarding travel management. Rather than utilizing existing processes or guaranteeing a more inclusive dialog with stakeholders, this legislation would marginalize tribal and other public stakeholders in the NEPA process by giving county government the final authority to approve a TMP. Therefore, the legislation as proposed creates inequities and is unnecessary because of the adequacy of existing legal avenues for participating in travel management planning and challenging unfavorable decisions regarding travel management.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. LECKY, FAIA, ARCHITECT OF RECORD FOR THE KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL AND A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION ON H.R. 318

I am currently a member of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation, and was Managing Principal for the design of the Korean War Veterans Memorial created by Cooper-Lecky Architects, Inc. in 1995. Cooper-Lecky Architects, Inc. was dissolved in 2000. I am currently the President of the Lecky Design Studio, an architectural firm in McLean, VA, which recently developed the schematic design proposal for the addition of the Wall of Remembrance, the focus of this hearing. As an added point of interest, Cooper-Lecky also served as Architects of Record for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial . . . working for several years with Maya Lin in the early 1980s.

There are several reasons for the genesis of H.R. 318

1. The veterans of the Korean War have been pleading for years for a more definitive representation of their fallen comrades on the Korean War Memorial. We initially believed that request had been satisfied by the creation of a National Park Service pavilion, located near the entrance to the Memorial, which allowed anyone—family member or friend—to type in the name of a fallen soldier and receive a printout of a personalized document that contained a photo and brief background information on the soldier in question. Sadly, this has not worked well in meeting its intended purpose. The pavilion is not readily located and/or recognized. Frequently equipment is out of service. The information on any specific soldier is only in the system if provided by the family of the deceased. And the enormity of the national sacrifice is not truly realized by the visitor when dealing with a single individual death.
2. During the original conflict, the Korean Military offered up thousands of their soldiers, known as KATUSAs, to fight alongside our troops. Exact numbers are unknown, but estimates are that roughly 8,000 of these men gave their lives in combat, side by side with our men in the field. The Korean Government does not list the names . . . only estimated casualty figures, but we feel it only appropriate that some recognition be given to these KATUSA fighters, as the number of our U.S. fallen would surely have grown without their courageous assistance.

3. The Korean government and its people are grateful, beyond bounds, for our help in preserving their freedom. Our memorial on the National Mall is on every Korean tourist's must see list. And they love this country and this memorial, but many feel that there is little about the memorial that speaks uniquely about Korea. Our hope is that artistic contributions by Korean artists can be added to the Wall of Remembrance to respond to those comments. As a designer, I feel this will make a unique and interesting contribution to the design of the wall.

Description of the proposed concept for the Wall of Remembrance

The current design of the Korean War Veterans Memorial consists of two major elements . . . what we refer to as the "Field of Service" and the "Pool of Remembrance". The Field of Service consists of a sloped triangular hill covered by 19 stainless steel ground troops moving up a hill toward the American flag. The entrance walk to the memorial runs along the north side of that triangle. The departing walk runs along the south side of the triangle. Visitors overlook the ground troops on their right and a granite wall of 2,500 etched faces of support forces on their left.

The top of the triangular field wedges its way into the black circular pool we call the "Pool of Remembrance". Our intention was to honor the ground troops with the stainless steel figures, the support forces with the faces on the wall, and the fallen soldiers with the black reflecting pool. The pool is surrounded by a treed, circular plaza with benches that were intended as a contemplative area for reflection on all the lives lost. Because the images are so powerful in and around the Field of Service, the circulation of visitors moves predominantly up one side of the triangle and down the other. The Pool of Remembrance is seen, but not fully, or evenly partially, understood by the average visitor. The plaza around the pool is only sparingly occupied.

Our hope, with the Wall of Remembrance, is to create a transparent glass wall, perhaps 7 or 8 feet high, that would encircle the perimeter of the plaza at the top of the hill. Etched into the glass would be the names of the 36,574 Americans who gave their lives in this conflict. But the wall would also contain a number of other potential elements, as yet undetermined or designed. These would include a statement (and numbers of dead) honoring the fallen KATUSA soldiers . . . perhaps homilies, images of appropriate flags or symbols honoring the contributing countries who gave support to our effort in Korea, and perhaps some artwork from Korea. The glass wall would not interfere with one's view across the Mall, and at night, the names would be lighted from concealed, below grade, fixtures . . . allowing the names to sparkle in the night air. Our hope is that the wall will draw people into the plaza so they can realize the intensity of the impact and the degree of sacrifice of one of the bloodiest conflicts in our Nation's history. Our belief is that this will add major enrichment and a depth of understanding to the message of this memorial without impacting the strength and beauty of that which exists on the site today.

Justification for the addition of the Wall of Remembrance

1. I have given many tours of the Vietnam and Korean Memorials. The typical take-away by the visitor to the Vietnam Memorial is "My God, I had no idea so many lives were lost in that conflict." The Korean War was, in fact, far more costly than any war we have fought. 1 in 9 men on the ground were killed. 58,000 lives were lost in Vietnam in 10 years of fighting. 36,574 lives were lost in Korea in just 3 years. The enormity of that loss is not perceived by the typical visitor to the Korean War Veterans Memorial.
2. Multiple revisions were made to the Vietnam Memorial over the years. The Three Soldiers statue was added; a new plaza was designed to accommodate the sculpture; the walks in and out of the memorial were widened numerous times; a flagpole was added; the entire circulation system at the west end of the Mall was redesigned to accommodate the changes; night lighting was added at the foot of the Wall.
The Wall of Remembrance needs to be added to deliver on the original intent of the legislation approving the memorial. Precedent has been set many times over to allow changes to memorials on the Mall.
3. There is a great dichotomy between the Vietnam and Korean Memorials. The original design for Vietnam honored the dead, but changes had to be made to honor the living who returned from the war. At the Korean Memorial the living were honored, but the dead were all but forgotten. The Wall of Remembrance will resolve that problem.

4. Please remember that this addition to the Korean Memorial will be funded by contributions from the public. There will be no cost to the government. The addition will introduce both new money and new jobs to our economy. And most importantly we will finally honor the enormous sacrifice made by our veterans . . . a long overdue debt.
5. Maya Lin's magnificent design for the Vietnam Memorial set a new precedent in funereal design. Every memorial since has borne the names of the fallen . . . The Pentagon Memorial, the Law Enforcement Memorial, the 9/11 Memorial in New York, the Shanksville Memorial. Yet all these were designed in a unique way. I would suggest that the Wall of Remembrance will not only add a meaningful element to the Korean War Memorial, but etching the names in glass will offer a unique presentation of the names.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION (NPCA)
ON H.R. 4029, H.R. 4049, AND H.R. 4182

Since 1919, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System. On behalf of our more than 800,000 members and supporters nationwide, I write to urge you to consider our positions on the following three bills when they come before the subcommittee tomorrow, June 10th.

H.R. 4029: *To require the Sec. of Interior to transfer Federal assets associated with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri for the purposes of maintaining a State park.*

NPCA **strongly opposes** this legislation. At issue in this unit of the National Park System is the balance between recreation and natural resource preservation in the General Management Plan. Public recreation and the preservation of natural resources are contained in the enabling legislation for this park unit and both can be balanced without degrading the rivers, sacrificing the quality of the visitor experience or negatively impacting the local economy. The National Park Service is currently working in partnership with the State of Missouri at this park and should continue to do so without threat of the transferring of assets.

H.R. 4049: *Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act.*

NPCA **supports** this legislation which would provide a needed boundary adjustment to Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (APIS) to incorporate the Ashland Breakwater Light within the Park unit. APIS is the premier place in the National Park System for lighthouse historic preservation and education. Currently, APIS has six light stations within the boundaries of the park, all of which are listed on the National Register. The exteriors of all these historic lights are publicly accessible, and many are open for public educational tours during the visitor season. The National Park Service provides abundant information on all aspects of the historic lights and their importance to the Nation as part of the park's public education and visitor enjoyment mission. The Ashland Light is also on the National Register of Historic Places and sits just outside the park boundary. The U.S. Coast Guard has announced plans to dispose of the Ashland Light under the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act. Without this legislation to bring it into APIS, the Ashland Light could be offered for public sale, with no guarantees that a buyer would maintain its historic integrity or provide access to the public.

H.R. 4182: *To provide that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways be administered in accordance with the General Management Plan for that unit of the National Park System.*

NPCA **strongly opposes** legislation that would nullify the current, draft General Management Plan (GMP) for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and require the Secretary of the Interior to manage the park unit according to the existing, 30-year-old 1984 GMP. It would also prohibit the Secretary from changing the park's management in the future with regard to recreation, motorized use, and preservation of natural resources. This legislation effectively removes the rights of the American people to comment on how a national park unit should be managed. During the public comment period for the current GMP, more than 16,000 unique comments were made by park visitors and others who care about this park unit. Congress should not tie the hands of the National Park Service or negate this public process.

Thank you for considering our views.

CRAIG D. OBEY,
Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD ON H.R. 4272

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SNOWMOBILE ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN,
JUNE 2, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

I am writing on behalf of the American Council of Snowmobile Associations which represents snowmobilers across the country in support of H.R. 4272, the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act.

We appreciate the language in H.R. 4272 which would require the Forest Service to consult and be in agreement with affected county government prior to altering access to the Forest Service lands—including closures or decommissioning of any roads or trails.

The snowmobile community is concerned with the lack of local input, access for motorized recreation being limited. Involving the local communities is crucial and endures those rural communities that depend on the economic impact and the residents that recreate on those lands the opportunity for input and comments.

We wholeheartedly support H.R. 4272.

Thank you for introducing this legislation. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE JOURDAIN.

AMERICAN MOTORCYCLIST ASSOCIATION,
WASHINGTON, DC,
MARCH 26, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REP. WALDEN:

The American Motorcyclist Association is writing to thank you for introducing H.R. 4272, the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act.

Founded in 1924, the AMA is the premier advocate of the motorcycling community. We represent the interests of millions of on- and off-highway motorcyclists and all-terrain-vehicle riders in the United States. Our mission is to promote the motorcycle lifestyle and protect the future of motorcycling.

As you are aware, this bill would require the U.S. Forest Service to consult and be in concurrence with affected county governments before altering access to the National Forest System—including closing or decommissioning roads and trails.

The AMA is concerned that due to a lack of local input, access for motorized recreation is being unfairly limited on USFS lands. By requiring concurrence from local governments, this bill would ensure that those who use Forest Service land for recreation would be afforded an opportunity to comment on access issues.

We would like to work with your office to ensure any future concerns we may have are addressed, so this important legislation can be signed into law.

Once again, thank you for introducing H.R. 4272.

If you have questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WAYNE ALLARD,
Vice President, Government Relations.

ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES,
JUNE 4, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS, *Chairman*,
Hon. PETER DEFazio, *Ranking Member*,
House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS AND RANKING MEMBER DEFazio:

The Association of Oregon Counties, which represents all 36 of the State's counties, wants the House Natural Resources Committee to know that we support H.R. 4272, the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act, sponsored by Congressman Greg Walden among other Members of Congress.

Eastern Oregon is dominated by National Forests. It is a way of life for Oregonians to have access to these vast acreages. Recent U.S. Forest Service travel management planning and inadequate forest health management have directly and negatively affected our communities near the National Forests. In spite of a wealth of first-hand knowledge locally about these forests, the sense here is that policies are driven from Washington, DC, without regard to distinct local conditions and in a one-size-fits-all direction.

H.R. 4272 will ensure local knowledge is applied to Federal decisionmaking on access. Governing bodies of directly affected counties, those who represent Oregonians who live among and depend upon the National Forests, will be able to be in direct partnership with the Forest Service on decisions to close or decommission a road in the National Forest.

Please give serious consideration to H.R. 4272, hear it, and pass it to the full House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

COMMISSIONER EARL FISHER,
Columbia County President.

BAKER COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
BAKER CITY, OR.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

The Baker County Board of Commissioners would like to go on record as supporting H.R. 4272. Baker County has been heavily involved with our citizens and other stakeholders in the debate over road closures and access issues in the National Forests.

This bill will require the Forest Service to formally coordinate their planning actions and allow the local governments to put forth the local customs, culture and economic input to various Federal actions.

Local government is in a unique position to coordinate with the Federal agencies and come up with common sense solutions which protect our multiple resources while allowing for sustainable economic activity.

Thank you for your efforts and please feel free to contact us with any questions or clarification needs.

Sincerely,

FRED WARNER JR.,
Chairman.
TIM L. KERNS,
Commissioner.
MARK E. BENNETT,
Commissioner.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN:

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input into a matter very important to me, my family and friends.

I, my family and friends are regular users of Public Lands. We use them in a sane and responsible manner and encourage others to do the same, we work in cooperation with public agencies and private groups to maintain and enhance our ability to remain in the places we love.

I am a member of several user groups and I am the Vice President of the Eastern Oregon All-Terrain Vehicle Association and one of the originators of the Forest Access For All organization. As a board member of the Grand Ronde Model Watershed organization appointed by the Union County Court I have worked extensively with Steve McClure and Mark Davidson to bring the message of sane use and utilization to the Watershed organization and through them to the State of Oregon.

Because of the impacts to local economies and traditional uses from the original Travel Management Activities the Model Watershed Board drafted, voted on and approved a policy to not support any management activity brought to the board for approval if it included travel or access restrictions.

On a local level over 4,500 pieces of input were received by the USFS on their original travel management activities. The tremendous majority of that input was in opposition to closure or restriction of access or use. I find it interesting the USFS is now attempting to obtain more input to ignore.

The Native American has certain uses and access and rightfully so. For years I have asked anyone that would listen what was required to have those same uses and access. A friend working for the USFS made me aware of a policy the USFS and other agencies try to keep hidden and is titled Traditional Cultural Properties. Multiple generations of my family were born in the United States. I was born five or six blocks north of the Oregon State Capitol building. I served abroad under the flag of the USA, have earned a living and paid taxes for over 65 years, and am a loyal U.S. citizen. It appears to an old, uncultured, patriotic, independent U.S. citizen that under the Traditional Cultural Properties language that I also qualify as a Native American and am worthy of that same level of use and access.

My activities require much travel in the eastern half of the State of Oregon. I observe empty store fronts, empty houses, mills closed and stock yards reducing activities. I see fewer and fewer opportunities for our young to enter the work force. I see increased regulation and restrictions further eliminating any opportunities for economic progress. In our part of the world the treasure we have to offer is our forests, meadows, streams and mountains and the very activities and objective of the Federal agencies is to lock our treasure away for few if any to enjoy.

I see this legislation as a first step in putting those with a true vested interest in control of their future. Not as a victim but as the creator and recipient of the benefits.

Thank you for past, present and future activities and this chance to relay my thoughts to others.

Sincerely,

LARRY L. CRIBBS.

EASTERN OREGON ALL TERRAIN VEHICLE ASSOCIATION,
 LA GRANDE, OR.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN:

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input into a matter very important to all of the members of our organization. We are Eastern Oregon All Terrain Association and represent well over 100 individuals and family members. Our members have enjoyed recreating on our Forests and public lands for multiple generations. We are responsible users of our lands and have always done our part to see that

others use them responsibly also. Our organization focuses on off-highway motorcycle and ATV use, but most of our members also enjoy driving on our National Forests roads, whether to reach a particular destination or just to enjoy the outdoors. Our organization also has an agreement with the Forest Service to help maintain the trails on two different trail systems. We spend a considerable amount of time each year maintaining these trails for our members and other users.

Over the last couple of decades our organization has given our input on multiple "Plans" that the Forest Service has started, yet never seemed to finish. These "Plans" have always included restrictions on motorized recreation and access to our Forests. Even though these plans have never been completed, our members have gradually seen their access to our public lands reduced, usually with no warning or reason for the closures.

The latest plan to be started, but not completed, was the Access Travel Management Plan (ATMP) for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. This plan would have changed forest access from open unless designated closed, to closed unless designated open. There was a great deal of time spent by our club members and others to inventory roads and give input on their use of the forest and its roads and trails. After all of our efforts it seemed to us that our input (the input of the people that live and use this Forest) was not taken seriously, or just ignored. It seemed as though the outcome of the plan was predetermined by someone somewhere that has never seen or even knows anything about our Forest. There seems to be a one size/plan fits all mindset in Federal Forest management decisions.

Even though the ATMP was ultimately withdrawn and put on hold, we now have a different Plan to worry about. This is the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision. We are going through the same process of giving input, which we have done several times in the past, to a Forest Service that seems to never acknowledge the fact that they run the public through this same drill over and over again, and then ignore us in the end. It is as if they will keep coming back with a different plan until we get so frustrated with them or tired of doing the same thing that we just go away.

Over the last couple of decades the local Forest Service has gone from an organization of people who grew up and lived in the region, that knew the forest and its users, to people who really know very little about the forest they work on or the people that use it. They spend far too much time behind a desk doing paper work and very little time actually on the forest managing it. Their lack of management has become their excuse for closing the Forest to the public. Their poor decisions are used as an excuse to punish the public by locking them out of the Forest. We are not the ones responsible for the Forest Service's incompetence.

We need to return to where local input into local Forest management decisions actually means something. Every Forest is different and should not be managed by one all-encompassing set of orders from somewhere in Washington DC. That is why the Forest Access in Rural Communities (FAIR) Act—H.R. 4272 is so important to the members of EOATVA and the citizens of northeast Oregon. This bill would return decisions on access to our Forests back to the people that actually use, know and love them.

Thank you for taking the time to hear our concerns and thoughts.

Sincerely,

MARK BARBER,
Secretary/Treasurer EOATVA.

FOREST ACCESS FOR ALL,
BAKER CITY, OR.

House Committee on Natural Resources,
Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR HONORABLE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Forest Access For All of Baker City would like to give our support of Forest Access in Rural Communities (FAIR) Act—H.R. 4272.

Our members, the local residents of eastern Oregon, western Idaho, southeastern Washington as well as groups of citizens across the United States have been involved in the Travel Management Planning Process to keep national forests open for both Subsistence and Recreational uses. Our communities are very dependent on an Open Forest system to access the needed resources that keep our rural com-

munities resilient and vibrant as we struggle through difficult socio-economic times our Nation has been experiencing.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was created with good intentions to make sure the “human environment” was considered in all Federal actions to address how our Federal agencies decisions affected human beings. NEPA has been amended and re-interpreted repeatedly over the last 34 years due to “policy by litigation”. NEPA is now a powerful tool to eliminate the human element from all Federal lands. The Travel Management Plan is essentially an accessory tool in accomplishing that very goal.

Our region of the State encompasses an area roughly the size of Virginia at 49,000 sq. miles with a population of roughly 100,000 residents. We have seen a substantial reduction in our main industrial economic engine of the timber industry over the last 30 years that has drastically reduced our abilities to facilitate the vibrant communities we desire.

One of the greatest assets we have to keeping our communities as resilient as we would like is our freedom to access the natural resources of our regions. When decisions are spearheaded and implemented by Federal mandates and not by local residents, Federal Land Managers tend to protect their perceived responsibilities to the central government in Washington DC are not as concerned with the impact of their decision on the local residents of the areas they are making decisions around.

FAFA's position is that County Administrations are the cornerstone of civil governments. When rural communities are allowed to partake in a process that allow them to not only engage, but affect a positive outcome for their families and residents, positive stewardship can take place that not only allows for effective landscape level management, but also leads to the resilient communities we all strive for. Over the last several years, our group and members have attempted tirelessly to be engaged in Forest Service decisions that affect the local residents, the local economy, ecology and lifestyle. The Travel Management Rule and the current Forest Plan Revision Proposal for the Blue Mountains are two such examples and residents have been met with stone walling, bullying and being marginalized from the process.

The residents of eastern Oregon and rural communities across the West must have a majority voice when it comes to how local resources are stewarded, and how accesses to those resources are managed. Our members are regular and responsible users of the forest, and often have been sustaining their lives from these forests for generations.

It is troubling to see how local communities lose their voice in the process, as access to the forests around them and they know well is restricted—often due to decision made by bureaucrats in Washington DC that may have never seen the roads they are closing. We have seen firsthand how this played out with the travel management planning process on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

Members of our organization and others across eastern Oregon dedicate hundreds of hours of time to travel and inventory roads, corresponding with U.S. Forest Service Staff, incorporating that information in to comments for the Forest Service, only to have that information largely ignored and popular trails, family hunting and camping spots are closed.

This bill would require the U.S. Forest Service to consult with, and get approval from, affected counties before altering access to National Forests, which we feel are strong starting points for counties to affectively manage the Health, Safety and Welfare of the residents they elected to represent and protect.

By requiring approval from local government, this legislation will ensure the communities most affected by these access changes have a fair say in their access to public land.

Forest Access For All appreciates the opportunities over the past several years to provide input on forest access issues to the subcommittee and on this legislation. We look forward to continuing to work with your subcommittee to assist in getting this legislation signed into law.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. GEORGE,
Executive Director.

COUNTY COURT OF GRANT COUNTY,
GRANT COUNTY, OREGON,
JUNE 4, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

The Grant County Court enthusiastically supports Representative Walden's H.R. 4272 legislation, also known as "the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act".

For too long the Forest Service has arbitrarily and capriciously closed roads without public notice or consultation. We in Grant County would argue that by doing so they, "the agency" have violated the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA). Like many rural communities, we in Grant County have an aging population, which a lack of motorized access has a profound detrimental effect on their lives, whether it involves hunting, camping or a leisurely drive through our beautiful National Forest. Another activity that these proposed closures would drastically reduce would be the ability of all our citizens to cut and gather firewood which is a large source of heat for our citizens.

Our local community, like many others across the Nation, has an in-depth historical knowledge of the roads in our county, noting that 64 percent of our county is managed by the Federal Government. With that being said, the transitory nature of personnel on our National Forest prevents a comprehensive or cohesive view of the access issues that many of our life-long citizens have.

The court feels that H.R. 4272 would assure that the agencies would be obligated to have local input on their actions concerning access travel management. Grant County has made its position quite clear by Ordinance 2013-01 adopted on 5/22/2013 (attached).

The Grant County Court would encourage the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America to adopt H.R. 4272.

Sincerely,

SCOTT W. MYERS,
County Judge.

BOYD BRITTON,
County Commissioner.

CHRIS B. LABHART,
County Commissioner.

Attachment: Ordinance 2013-01

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
FOR THE COUNTY OF GRANT

AN ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO PUBLIC ROAD CLOSURES } ORDINANCE
WITHIN GRANT COUNTY, OREGON } 2013-01

THIS BEING the 22nd day of May, 2013, and a day set aside for a regular meeting of the Grant County Court; and there being present County Judge Scott W. Myers, and County Commissioners Chris B. Labhart and Boyd Britton.

WHEREAS, the safety and well-being of Grant County citizens and the custom and culture of Grant County are closely tied to the public lands within the boundary of Grant County; and

WHEREAS, the roads, trails, stock driveways, and by-ways over and across these public lands have customarily been utilized unrestricted by Grant County residents for search and rescue, fire protection, firewood gathering, access for hunting and fishing, livestock management, logging activities, mining, recreational uses and general welfare.

THEREFORE, be it hereby ordained that for the safety and well-being of Grant County citizens all roads, trails, stock driveways, and by-ways over and across public lands within the boundary of Grant County, Oregon shall remain open as historically and customarily utilized consistent with the Grant County plans and policies, unless otherwise authorized for closure by the Grant County Court and the Grant County Sheriff.

THIS ORDINANCE is adopted this 22nd day of May, 2013.

GRANT COUNTY COURT

Scott W. Myers, County Judge

Chris B. Labhart, Commissioner

Boyd Britton, Commissioner

GRANT COUNTY SHERIFF

Glenn E. Palmer, Sheriff

ATTEST:

Mary R. Ferrioli, Court Secretary

LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
LAKEVIEW, OREGON,
JUNE 11, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

The Lake County Board of Commissioners would like to extend to you our strong support of the Forest Access in Rural Communities (FAIR) Act or H.R. 4272.

This Board has expressed on numerous occasions frustration with the Travel Management Plan created for the purpose of closing of roads on public lands utilized by our citizens. We feel that the process followed by the Forest Service for these closures in no way took into consideration the concerns and comments submitted by our citizens or by this Board. Our greatest concern is the way in which this process, like so many others, completely ignored the input of the Board of Commissioners as the local governmental authority.

H.R. 4272, in our opinion, would provide assurance that agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service would be obligated to consider local input in the future before taking action on travel management plans related to our public lands. We feel that local governments have always been the best resources for information when addressing concerns and feel even stronger that those resources have been vastly ignored.

We appreciate your development of H.R. 4272 and for your continued efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely,

DAN SHOUN,
Chair.

BRADLEY J. WINTERS,
Vice-Chair.

KEN KESTNER,
Commissioner.

OREGON STATE SNOWMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
LAPINE, OREGON,
MAY 14, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

The Oregon State Snowmobile Association and its membership of snowmobilers support H.R. 4272, the Forest in Rural Communities Act, introduced by Congressman Greg Walden.

Local input should be a big part of the decisionmaking process, assuring the needs, concerns and desires of the people most affected are involved. Those living and working in these areas are in the best position to understand the impact on their local economy and environment.

Decisions being made during the Travel Management Rule process involving altering public access to the forest lands, decommissioning roads, trails and closing of roads, should be based on local input as each area is unique. Decisions should not be made on the basis of one size fits all, but each area looked at as the distinctive area it is with the input of county and local leaders and those who use the area.

Policies and rules adopted without consideration or understanding of local circumstances can have unintended consequences. Local flexibility makes common sense.

Sincerely,

PEGGY SPIEGER,
OSSA Executive Director.

PUBLIC LANDS COUNCIL,
NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S BEEF ASSOCIATION,
JUNE 9, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

Re: Livestock Industry Support for the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act
(H.R. 4272)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN:

The Public Lands Council (PLC) and the National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA) support the Forest Access in Rural Communities Act (H.R. 4272). PLC is the only national organization dedicated solely to representing the roughly 22,000 ranchers who operate on Federal lands. NCBA is the beef industry's largest and oldest national marketing and trade association, representing American cattlemen and women who provide much of the Nation's supply of food and own or manage a large portion of America's private property.

Your bill would stop the misguided travel management rule on national forests in the West and would promote local control over future proposals that could restrict forest access. This law would force the Forest Service to listen to local residents input before they make a decision to restrict access to public forests. Far too often, Federal agencies make decisions that affect local landowners and public land permittees and ignore the input they have received, or worse, don't even allow the opportunity for input. H.R. 4272 would end this abuse of agency decisionmaking.

The Travel Management rule requires designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle use. According to the Forest Service, designations will be made by class of vehicle and, if appropriate, by time of year. The final rule prohibits the use of motor vehicles off the designated system, as well as use of motor vehicles on routes and in areas that are not consistent with the designations. While the rule is supposed to address the needs for access to National Forest System lands, far too often we see decisions to close roads made at the agency level without the proper level of input from local residents. This would directly impact ranchers who hold grazing permits on Forest Service lands, as it would be impossible for them to utilize their permits and properly manage and improve the Federal land that they are responsible for. Your legislation would ensure that local interests are kept at the forefront of the discussion where they belong.

PLC and NCBA applaud your efforts, and appreciate the opportunity to provide our input on behalf of our members—the Nation's food and fiber producers. We encourage Members of Congress to support this positive and proactive piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

BRICE LEE,
PLC President.

BOB MCCAN,
NCBA President.

SPORTSMEN RIDE RIGHT,
JUNE 24, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS, *Chairman,*
House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC 20515.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO, *Ranking Member,*
House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS AND RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO:

Sportsmen Ride Right is a coalition of hunters and anglers who believe that motorized access is an essential use of our public lands that must be managed in a way that ensures quality hunting and fishing opportunities.

Travel management, the process through which we decide where we will and will not drive on public land, is a vital process that protects key habitat for fish and games species, reduces user conflicts and makes sure that our multiple use forests are managed in a sustainable and fiscally responsible way.

Efforts to stop Forest Service travel management and undo previous planning decisions would negate the considerable efforts of sportsmen and others from around the country. Halting travel planning would also increase road maintenance costs and lower the overall quality of our public lands.

Besides maintaining good fishing and hunting, travel management seeks to reduce user conflicts and to create a better experience for everyone. An early morning elk hunter glassing a hillside in the back country does not want to see a pickup truck drive into the spot he's glassing. A rancher paying to graze cows on National Forest land does not want unregulated motorized use damaging the grass and water resources he pays to use. And an ATV rider using an ATV-only trail does not want to encounter a bunch of full-size vehicles plugging the trail.

As a coalition, we believe strongly that designated route planning is a necessity. A designated system of well-maintained roads is essential to preserve quality hunting and angling on public lands.

We oppose legislative efforts such as H.R. 4272 that would halt travel management or overturn existing travel plans.

Sincerely,

GIFFORD PINCHOT OFF HIGHWAY VEHICLE ALLIANCE
 SOUTHWEST CONSOLIDATED SPORTSMEN
 DONA ANA COUNTY SPORTSMEN
 MULEY FANATIC FOUNDATION
 BOW HUNTERS OF WYOMING
 MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION
 NEW MEXICO WILDLIFE FEDERATION
 WYOMING WILDLIFE FEDERATION
 IDAHO WILDLIFE FEDERATION
 NEW MEXICO BACKCOUNTRY HUNTERS AND ANGLERS
 CALIFORNIA COUNCIL OF TROUT UNLIMITED
 NEW MEXICO TROUT
 PENNSYLVANIA STATE DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE
 SNAKE RIVER WATERKEEPERS, IDAHO
 EMERGING RIVERS GUIDE SERVICE, WASHINGTON
 ANGLING TRADE
 WASHINGTON BACKCOUNTRY HUNTERS AND ANGLERS
 WASHINGTON RECREATIONAL AND GOVERNMENT COORDINATION SERVICES
 GARDENSWARTZ SPORTING GOODS, COLORADO
 WASHINGTON STATE COUNCIL OF TROUT UNLIMITED
 ROARING FORK ANGLERS, COLORADO
 ALPINE ANGLING, COLORADO
 DOLORES RIVER BOATING ADVOCATES, COLORADO
 RICO ALPINE SOCIETY, COLORADO
 EMERALD WATER ANGLERS, WASHINGTON
 THE REEL LIFE, NEW MEXICO
 TAOS FLY SHOP, NEW MEXICO
 MESILLA VALLEY FLYFISHERS, NEW MEXICO
 CADDIS FLY SHOP, EUGENE, OREGON
 ROYAL TREATMENT FLY SHOP IN WEST LINN, OREGON
 ALASKA FLY FISHING GOODS, JUNEAU, ALASKA
 ALAN CORBETT PHOTOGRAPHY, JUNEAU, ALASKA
 ADVENTURES IN ALASKA, JUNEAU, ALASKA
 LAND OF ENCHANTMENT GUIDE SERVICE
 SOLITARY ANGLER, NEW MEXICO
 SAN JUAN ANGLER, COLORADO
 INTERMOUNTAIN AQUATICS, IDAHO
 VICTOR EMPORIUM AND FLY SHOP, IDAHO
 DVORAK EXPEDITIONS, COLORADO

UMATILLA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
 PENDLETON, OR,
 JUNE 5, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

Please add Umatilla County to the growing list of counties who strongly support House Resolution 4272.

We agree with our colleagues in Wallowa County that the Travel Management Plan created considerable hostility in northeast Oregon and that the tremendous overreach incumbent in the plan addresses problems which simply do not exist.

What is of even greater concern to us is the plan reflects yet another effort by the Federal Government to usurp the wisdom and authority of local government structures. Thank you for H.R. 4272 which would prevent such overreach and for your continued representation of rural counties and your awareness of our needs and interests.

In our estimation, the Travel Plan is simply another reflection of the disparity that exists across the country in terms of Federal ownership. As you are well aware,

issues such as this are minor in Eastern States where the percentage of Federal property ownership is extremely low. In States like Oregon, where such a significant portion of our land mass is federally owned, issues such as this are magnified many times over. We suspect Eastern Members of Congress would take a considerably different view in matters such as this if a significant portion of their State were to suddenly disappear from private ownership.

Local government has always been the most effective avenue for addressing the unique needs of the particular region and we believe you clearly understand this principle. Thank you for H.R. 4272 and for your efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. ELFERING,
GEORGE L. MURDOCK,
W. LAWRENCE GIVENS,
Umatilla County Board of Commissioners.

UNION COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
LA GRANDE, OR,
JUNE 5, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

The Union County Board of Commissioners are in full support of H.R. 4272, the "Forest Access in Rural Communities Act". We appreciate your recognition of the negative impact of the current Travel Management Rule on the employment, economy and quality of life of our citizens. Your proposed H.R. will require the Forest Service to incorporate the needs, uses, and input of affected communities before taking any travel management action. There is a critical need for this change.

Federal national forest lands comprise a large percentage of the geographic area included in Union County and surrounding rural counties. Access to much of this area has already been restricted impacting employment and other economic benefits and quality of life for citizens. County officials and our citizens have been very involved in the existing Travel Management process and have been frustrated and disappointed with the outcomes and lack of consideration of our input and efforts.

We believe the requirements proposed in H.R. 4272 are a step in the right direction of including more local involvement in decisions that greatly impact our local citizens in so many ways. Thank you for your efforts toward improving a flawed process.

Sincerely,

STEVE MCCLURE,
Chairman.
MARK D. DAVIDSON,
Commissioner.
WILLIAM D. ROSHOLT,
Commissioner.

WALLOWA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
ENTERPRISE, OR,
MAY 28, 2014.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN:

We would like to take this opportunity to comment on your Travel Management Bill, H.R. 4272. You are very aware of the anguish and hostility that was displayed in northeast Oregon when the Forest Service rolled out their Travel Management Plan. That plan, with its tremendous overreach, looked for solutions for problems that don't exist was the epitome of Federal Government agencies usurping local gov-

ernment's authority and trampling on the rights of our citizens. H.R. 4272 would prevent that draconian approach from happening in the future.

Wallowa County's approach to the Travel Management Rule was to complete a roads analysis on all of the National Forest roads. Thirty-three volunteers spent days driving and analyzing the roads based on 17 criteria. That information resulted in the Wallowa County Travel Management Plan that was adopted into our local Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The information was also submitted to the Forest Service for inclusion in their plan, but was largely ignored. Our citizens will not tolerate the Forest Service heavy handedness of travel management, the resources on the National Forest do not necessitate such an approach and H.R. 4272 would correct this very real problem in northeast Oregon.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed legislation. We look forward to continuing the dialog on Federal land management issues and policy decisions.

Sincerely,

MIKE HAYWARD,
Chairman.

PAUL CASTILLEJA,
Commissioner.

SUSAN ROBERTS,
Commissioner.

WALLOWA VALLEY TRAIL RIDERS ASSOCIATION.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN:

The Wallowa Valley Trail Rider Association was formed back in 1995 out of a small group of Wallowa County residents that all had the same vision: to work with the USFS and local governments to create, maintain and assist in the past, present, and future OHV opportunities in Wallowa County. Since then the group has grown from a handful of dedicated people to over 25 families that still share the same goals that the club was founded on. One specific project that the club has been working on since 1996, an OHV trail system, now located in the Sled Springs area of Wallowa County, is a prime example of why the local people need a voice on matters that affect their backyards and why the governing agencies need to listen.

This trail system was originally started in an area mutually decided and agreed upon by all parties after several years and hundreds of volunteer man hours, even over \$20,000 worth of State grant money was spent mapping trails one special interest group was able to obliterate all the work that was done and send the project packing to a different area to start from ground zero. Ten years later the same exact thing happened again . . . the group was unable to get the system completely obliterated but after 2½ years in litigations the proposal that the Local club had worked so hard on was all but gone and in its place was a proposal that was signed and ready to implement but clearly was not what the local club and USFS had worked on for nearly 10 years. The local voices were yet again unheard.

The members of our club are all responsible users that understand how important it is to leave the smallest footprint possible when using the forest. Our members are all active in volunteering their time to implementing and maintaining our trail systems. We all have spent countless hours inventorying roads and creating viable comments for the forest service to use in their process. Many of our members have been not only using our forests for generations but have had a hand in many various partnerships with the local and federal governments with respect to taking care of our forests. All of this work appears to be nothing more than busy work given to the local public to only be ignored and shoved to the side when the final decisions come about. All will, myself included, vouch for how much the decisions being made in our backyards today are not being made with the best intentions of the people that call it home but for the best results for the private agenda.

This is why we need to require that the Forest Service consult with affected counties and gain approval from the people before any changes are made to any access on the forest.

We appreciate the opportunities to provide input on forest access issues and on legislation that affect us and our ways of life. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your office so this legislation can be wrote into law.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DUSTIN JAMES,
President.

LETTER SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA ON H.R. 4029
AND H.R. 4182

CONSERVATION FEDERATION OF MISSOURI,
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI,
JUNE 9, 2014.

Hon. ROB BISHOP, *Chairman*,
Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA, *Ranking Member*,
House Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulations,
1324 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC 20515.

Re: Comments on the proposed transfer of the ONSR to the State of Missouri
H.R. 4029 and H.R. 4182

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA:

We appreciate the opportunity to send you our comments on two bills coming before your committee in the form of H.R. 4029 and H.R. 4182 that would involve the transfer of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) to the State of Missouri.

The Conservation Federation of Missouri (CFM) our State's largest citizen conservation organization is opposed to the idea of transferring the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) to the State of Missouri. We also encourage you to oppose any legislation that would include such a transfer. As Missourians we should all take great pride that we have a National Park such as the ONSR in our State.

CFM is Missouri's largest citizen conservation organization with 80 affiliated sportsmen groups (i.e. Hunters, fishermen, campers, hikers, trappers, boaters, naturalist, etc.) and over 100,000 members statewide. Since this idea of turning the ONSR over to the State of Missouri first surfaced several months ago we have found no one in the ranks of our many affiliates or members that thinks this is a good idea.

I have enclosed a recent resolution on the OSNR passed by our members at the 78th CFM Annual Meeting this past May held in Jefferson City, Missouri. CFM remains firmly supportive of the National Parks Service and its efforts to enhance and protect the Riverways. The OSNR first designated by Congress in 1964 has been in the good hands of the National Parks Service for the past 50 years and it should remain a National Park.

If there are differences on how the park should be managed let it be addressed through meaningful dialog and sound planning. A transfer of the ONSR is not in the best interest of the resource, finances or visitor experience. Let's not jeopardize one of our "National Treasures".

We appreciate your consideration and support on this matter with the hope that you will oppose these measures. If CFM can be of assistance please feel free to contact us at anytime.

Respectfully Yours,

RON COLEMAN,
CFM 1st Vice-President.

Enclosure

Committee: Parks
 Author: Ron Coleman

“Stop OSNR Transfer to the State of Missouri”

WHEREAS, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are two of the state’s most outstanding waters, Flowing through the heart of the Missouri Ozarks amid high bluffs of dolomite and limestone, vast forests of oak and shortleaf pine, and numerous caves and springs;

AND WHEREAS, more than one million people, including visitors from around the country, enjoy the clean water, spectacular scenery, and fish and wildlife of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers each year;

AND WHEREAS, in 1964, Congress recognized the outstanding qualities of these two streams by making them the first federally protected rivers in the nation, to be managed under the auspices of the National Park Service and encompassed within a national park known as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways;

AND WHEREAS, it is imperative that Missourians ensure that the natural resources of the Scenic Riverways are protected for future generations to enjoy;

AND WHEREAS, there is a *movement to transfer the management and ownership* of the Scenic Riverways from the National Park Service to the State of Missouri;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Conservation Federation of Missouri assembled in Jefferson City, Missouri, this 22nd day of March, 2014, does hereby oppose any legislation advocating the transfer of the OSNR to the State of Missouri.

RESOLUTION SUMMARY—Oppose Transfer of the Ozark Scenic Riverways to the State

RESOLUTION TO: Governor Jay Nixon, Missouri Legislature, U.S. Congressional Representatives, Mo.DNR Director and the Director of Missouri State Parks.

[LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD RETAINED IN THE
 COMMITTEE’S OFFICIAL FILES]

—State of Missouri—House of Representatives Resolution for the
 Ozark National Scenic Riverways

—State of Missouri—Senate Substitute for Senate Concurrent
 Resolution No. 22 for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways

